

METHODIST REVIEW

(BIMONTHLY.)

J. W. MENDENHALL, D.D., LL.D., Editor.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
I. THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS AND THE HIGHER CRITICISM. <i>Professor Charles H. Bradley, D.D., Garrett Biblical Institute, Evanston, Ill.</i>	518
II. TATIAN'S DIATHESSARON. <i>Professor Henry M. Harman, D.D., LL.D., Dickinson College, Carlisle, Pa.</i>	531
III. GEORGE BANCROFT. <i>Ross C. Houghton, D.D., Portland, Ore.</i>	543
IV. NATURAL SELECTION AND CHRISTIANITY. <i>Professor H. W. Conn, Wesleyan University, Middletown, Conn.</i>	552
V. A LESSON FROM THE OLD WORLD FOR THE NEW. <i>Elbert S. Todd, D.D., Washington, D. C.</i>	566
VI. THE OLD TESTAMENT AFTER THE BATTLE. <i>Edward Cowley, D.D., New York, N. Y.</i>	577
VII. CONSTITUTIONALITY OF PARAGRAPH ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-THREE. <i>Allen A. Gee, D.D., Greencastle, Ind.</i>	591
EDITORIAL NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS:	
OPINION.	604
CURRENT DISCUSSIONS.	609
Of the Use and Value of the "Fathers," 609; Was John Wesley the Founder of American Methodism? 618; A Reply, but Not a Refutation, 624.	
PROGRESS OF CIVILIZATION.	633
THE ARENA	637
Mission Among the Wyandots, 637; The Agricultural Depression, 638; Whom He Did Fore-know, 640; Commendation in Life, or Floral Tributes in Death, 640; Oxford or University Chapters of the Epworth League, 641.	
THE ITINERANTS' CLUB	643
The Saving Instinct, 643; The Annual Vacation, 644; The Decomposition of Literary Produc-tions, 644; Questions Relating to the Choice of a Sermon Subject, 647.	
FOREIGN RÉSUMÉ	648
Some Leaders of Thought, 648; Recent Theological Literature, 650; Religious, 654.	
EDITORIAL REVIEWS:	
SPIRIT OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES	656
BOOKS: CRITIQUES AND NOTICES	664

NEW YORK:
HUNT & EATON.

CINCINNATI:
CRANSTON & STOWE.

SUBSCRIPTION PRICE, POSTAGE INCLUDED, \$2 50.

[Entered at the Post-office, New York, N. Y., as second-class mail matter.]

Skill, Experience, Energy, and Capital have been combined for over fifteen years to make and to keep the

Remington



Standard Typewriter

the best Writing-Machine for all the practical uses of daily work. The clear, readable type, ease of operation, and simplicity of mechanism of the Remington render it invaluable for preachers and public speakers.

Send for Illustrated Catalogue, showing extra large type, suitable for sermons, etc.

Wyckoff, Seamans & Benedict,

327 Broadway, New York.

d
or
co

all
k.
of
h-
it
b-



METHODIST REVIEW.

JULY, 1891.

ART. I.—THE EPISTLE TO THE EPHESIANS AND THE HIGHER CRITICISM.*

QUESTIONS of the higher criticism from German, British, and native sources press themselves more and more upon the attention of our American Churches. That these inquiries involve the gravest issues will become more apparent if, as seems probable, the public interest now so much absorbed by the startling claims of certain Old Testament critics shall turn soon again to the New Testament field, where the most practical and vital problems are to be solved. In discussing these matters upon their merits, it is often necessary to enter into minute particulars of historical and literary criticism, and, to a certain extent, to meet those who deny the generally received views concerning the New Testament writings upon hostile grounds. Minute details need not discredit biblical criticism any more than they do bacteriology. In both cases they sometimes involve wide-reaching results. A willingness to test negative conclusions upon neutral ground is, on the part of a defender of the faith, a proof of confidence in his cause, for which he finds high precedent in the early Church, as well as in later times. The believer's protest is not against higher criticism, as such, which, when sober and conscious of its own limitations, has been most helpful in determining and defending the truth, but rather against a *kind* of higher criticism which has inserted

* The fourth article on New Testament books is here presented. No reader of the *Review* will omit it.—EDITOR.

radical negation in its very premises, and arrogantly proclaimed itself as alone scientific.

It is difficult to characterize summarily the parties in a debate which has lasted more than half a century, involved many changes of position and of leaders, and produced thick volumes by the score. It will, perhaps, serve the purposes of the present paper to indicate the diverse stand-points occupied by a typical evangelical pastor in America and a radical German New Testament critic of this negative type. Such an American pastor regards the New Testament as an organic whole, written by men supernaturally inspired, who were divinely guided in their work and preserved from substantial error. He accepts the miracles therein recorded, and believes in the resurrection of Jesus Christ as an objective and fundamentally important fact. He receives the canonical books as providentially collected and preserved and satisfactorily attested by honest men who had sufficient evidence for their decisions. These conclusions are finally confirmed for him by the unique excellence of their writings and his personal experience of the truth of their most vital statements.

The radical German critic takes an entirely different view of the case. To him the New Testament consists of miscellaneous writings whose origin was entirely natural, and whose association in one collection was an after-thought, due to the necessities of later times, and accomplished by uncritical, ill-informed, not to say designing, men. He finds these writings full of errors and discrepancies. He regards all miracles as unhistorical, and attributes the early belief in the resurrection to subjective visions induced by religious excitement. He attempts to reconstruct primitive Christian history on the principles of natural development, and devotes vast learning and untiring energy to explaining this assumed evolution. He accepts the four great epistles of Paul* as unquestionably genuine, and perhaps three or four of the minor epistles. But at least two of the first three gospels he considers dependent and secondary, and no one of them is for him, in its present form, an apostolic writing. The fourth gospel, he thinks, was not written by John; the Acts he deems historically unreliable, while the pastoral and catholic epistles, and Second Thessalonians and Ephesians, he

* Romans, Galatians, First and Second Corinthians.

regards as spurious. His definite task is to give a natural explanation of the events and records of early Christianity. That this negative critic is a true son of his age is evident from the fact that he appears first in connection with deistic rationalism, and has flourished under the influence of pantheistic and skeptical philosophies, and especially Hegelianism.

A few quotations and illustrations will justify the portrait we have sketched. The famous Tübingen critic Baur declared his principles in the following unmistakable language: * "Above all things we must insist upon an entirely untrammelled judgment, a freedom from dogmatic presuppositions, and the rejection of miracles as impossible. He who sees a miracle at the beginning of Christianity steps at once thereby out of all historical connections. The historical view is even concerned in resolving the miracle of the absolute beginning into its natural elements." That is to say, to be *free* from presupposition one must *presuppose* that miracles are impossible! That alone *can* be historical which is natural! This cool assumption, this outright begging of the question, which Baur made the chief corner-stone of his system, has been adopted by many of his successors. But since Baur held to the genuineness of the four chief Pauline epistles, and these contain emphatic testimony to the supernatural resurrection of Jesus, we need not be surprised to find later representatives of the negative criticism strenuously laboring to break the force of this testimony. Hausrath † seeks to explain the conversion of Paul by a merely subjective vision resulting from a traceable psychological process. Weizsäcker ‡ pretends to solve the difficulty which criticism meets in the still earlier belief of the original apostles. This belief he supposes to have originated in a subjective vision of Peter, and to have been extended by similar visions of others. § There was a veritable epidemic of visions. Pfleiderer, though differing widely from Baur in many things, agrees with him in the emphatic rejection of miracles. It is further significant that from among the most distinguished of Baur's successors not less than three have

* Quoted by Schulze in Zöckler's *Handbuch der theologischen Wissenschaften*, 1889, I², p. 15. See Baur's *Das Christenthum der drei ersten Jahrhunderten*, p. 1.

† *Der Apostel Paulus*, 1866, 1869.

‡ *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, 1886.

§ Schwegler to history, Köstlin to æsthetics, and Zeller to philosophy.

turned from theology to other branches of science. The new campaign* against the chief Pauline epistles is an extreme manifestation of the same spirit of hostility to miracles. The English work entitled *Supernatural Religion*, which Lightfoot has shown to be an unscholarly compilation from German sources, is a further illustration of this radical position. These extreme critics accordingly assume that Christianity is the result of a natural development, whose basis is the natural religion of the Jews and the purely human life, teachings, and death of Jesus. These elements were developed and modified successively by the prejudices and delusions of the original disciples; by Paul's visions and rabbinic reasonings; and by Greek, Alexandrian, and other contemporary philosophies and culture. This evolution was at once accompanied and assisted by a literary activity of which fragments remain; but its course was an obscure one from the time of the crucifixion until, in the latter half of the second century, there emerged into historical light together the old Catholic Church and a collection of Christian Scriptures. That the Church did not understand its own history is proved, according to this view, by its faith in its supernatural origin. To reconstruct the history of this evolution, and re-adjust the New Testament writings in harmony with it, is the definite aim of this extreme criticism.

To state this case is to prove that an evangelical pastor of the type described cannot accept the premises of these radical critics without self-stultification. Still further, such conclusions of these critics as rely for their support upon these presuppositions lose their force for those who repudiate these assumptions.

The relative indifference of the radical critics to the external evidence adduced for any New Testament writing is a necessary corollary to their main position. The facts of this evidence, however, remain, and will continue to have great weight for unprejudiced minds. The external attestation of the Epistle to the Ephesians is abundant. In the latter half of the second century great representatives of the Church in centers as widely separated as Lyons, Alexandria, and Carthage—namely, Iræneus,† Clement of Alexandria,‡ and Tertullian§—speak of

* Loman, *Questiones Paulinæ*, 1882; Pierson and Naber, *Verisimilitia*, 1886; Steck, *Galaterbrief*, etc., 1888; Völter, *Komposition der paulinischen Hauptbriefe*, 1890.

† *C. Hær.*, v, 2, 3; i, 8, 5. ‡ *Strom.*, iv, 8; iii, 4, 28. § *Ad Marcion*, v, 11, 17.

Ephesians as unquestioningly accepted by Christians as an epistle of Paul. It is given in the Muratorian Fragment.* It was unquestionably contained in the canon of the heretical Marcion as the Epistle to the Laodiceans. It was often quoted by the Valentinians. It is clearly quoted in the Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians,† and is probably alluded to in the Ignatian Epistles.‡ Justin Martyr knew and used it.§ It is possibly referred to in the *Shepherd of Hermas*,|| in the *Teaching of the Twelve Apostles*,¶ and by Clement of Rome.** So clear and abundant is this testimony that Mangold admits that "already, in the early decades of the second century, it must have been universally recognized as the work of the apostle Paul;"†† and Renan says that "it is, perhaps, the epistle from which there are most early quotations as the composition of the Apostle to the Gentiles."‡‡

In direct opposition to this external evidence, the genuineness of the epistle is challenged on internal grounds. Pfeiderer says§§ that in his judgment "the spuriousness of the Epistle to the Ephesians and the Pastoral Epistles belongs to the most certain results of biblical criticism." The history of this opposition to Ephesians extends from about 1825 to the present.|| Most of those who in Germany call themselves the Unbiased Critics now reject it. Of these some repudiate Colossians also, while others contend that Colossians was originally written by Paul,

* P. 10, b, line 20. See Westcott *On the Canon*, 1881, p. 525.

† *Ad Phil.*, i, 3. *Comp. Eph.* ii, 8. ‡ *Ig. ad Eph.*, xii, 2. *Comp. Eph.* iii, 4.

§ *Dial.*, 39, 87, 120. *Comp. Eph.* iv, 8, and i, 21.

|| *Maudat.*, iii, 4, and x, 1, 2. *Comp. Eph.* iv, 30.

¶ *Didache*, xi, 3, 11, and xiii, 1, f.

** 1 *Clem. ad Cor.*, xlii, 6. *Comp. Eph.* iv, 4, and Salmon's *Introd.*, 1885, p. 475.

†† Bleek's *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, 1886, p. 588.

‡‡ Quoted by Salmon, p. 475. §§ *Der Paulinismus*, 2te Aufl., 1890, p. 45.

|| Usteri expressed doubts in 1824. De Wette's *N. T. Introduction* in 1826 presented grounds for doubt in a striking manner. Later he rejects the epistle. About the same time Schleiermacher, in his University Lectures, conjectured that it was prepared by Tychicus on the model of Colossians at the request of Paul. See Holtzmann's *Kritik der Epheser- und Kolosserbriefe*, 1872, p. 2, ff. Prominent among rejecters of the epistle are De Wette, Baur, Schwegler, Zeller, Hilgenfeld, Hausrath, Hitzig, Holtzmann, Ewald, Pfeiderer, Weizsäcker, Schmiedel, Hönig, and Von Soden, in Germany; Hoekstra, in Holland; Renan, in France; and Davidson, in England. Among its defenders are numbered Neander, Meyer, Bleek, Reuss, Hoffmann, Klöpper, and Schenkel, in Germany; Salmon, Lightfoot, Farrar, Beet, and Ellicott, in England; and Koster, in Holland.

but has been more or less interpolated.* The conclusions of the objectors to Ephesians vary greatly from each other, as will become more evident as we proceed. They have put its date at various points between 70 and 140.† But the objections they urge may be classified as historical and literary. They are drawn from the contents of the epistle as these are related to the life of Paul and the history of the Church; as they are related to the other Pauline epistles, especially Colossians; and to other New Testament writings. It is claimed that the epistle contains clear marks of a stage of development in church life and in doctrine which was not reached until after the death of Paul; that it is manifestly dependent upon Colossians and other Pauline epistles; and yet differs widely from the acknowledged letters in style and vocabulary.

Preparatory to considering the strongest arguments of the opposition, I present in parallel columns summaries of Colossians and Ephesians, in which an attempt is made to represent graphically their chief correspondences and diversities. Capitalized words call attention to similarities, and italicized to differences.

COLOSSIANS.

Chapter I. Paul and Timothy salute the saints at Colossæ.

We thank God, the Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, for your faith in Christ and love toward the saints, of which we have heard from *Ephras*, who first preached the gospel to you.

Hence we pray that ye may be filled with the KNOWLEDGE of his will and may WALK WORTHILY, giving thanks to him who translated us from darkness to LIGHT, even unto the kingdom of the *Son of his love*; in whom we have REDEMPTION, the forgiveness of our sins, who is the *image of the invisible God*, the first-born of

EPHESIANS.

Chapter I. Paul salutes the saints which are [at Ephesus].

Blessed be the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ for all our blessings in the *heavenly places* in Christ, according as he *foreordained* us unto adoption through Jesus Christ.

In whom we have our REDEMPTION through his blood, the forgiveness of our trespasses, having made known unto us the MYSTERY of his will to SUM UP ALL THINGS in Christ, the things in the heavens and the things on the earth, in whom we were made a heritage, both WE [Jews] who had before hoped in Christ and YE

* Holtzmann finds only about one third of Colossians genuine. The rest was interpolated by the forger of Ephesians. Von Soden regards all as genuine excepting i, 15-20, and ii, 10, 15, 18, which are the interpolations of a third hand.

† Ewald 75; Scholten 80; Von Soden 70-90; Holtzmann and Mangold about 100; Baur, Volkmar, Hausrath, Hilgenfeld, and Davidson about 140.

all creation, for *in him* were all things created, visible or invisible, thrones, DOMINIONS, PRINCIPALITIES, or POWERS. He is the HEAD of the BODY, the Church. God willed that all the FULLNESS should dwell in him, and to RECONCILE through the BLOOD of his CROSS ALL THINGS on the earth and in the heavens. And you, who were once ALIENATED and enemies, hath he reconciled to present you holy before him if ye continue steadfast.

I rejoice in my sufferings for the Church, of which I became a minister according to the STEWARDSHIP given me for you, to fulfill the word of God, even the MYSTERY hid from all ages but now manifested to the saints, which is CHRIST IN YOU [GENTILES], the hope of glory.

Chapter II. I wrestle in prayer for you and the believers at *Laodicea* and all who have not seen my face in the flesh, that they may be united in love and may know the MYSTERY of God which is Christ, in whom all treasures of wisdom and KNOWLEDGE are hidden. This I say that no one may DELUDE you with persuasive speech or philosophy. In Christ dwells all the FULLNESS of the *Godhead bodily*, in him were ye spiritually circumcised, with him were ye, in baptism, buried and raised again. He cancelled the bond of ORDINANCES which was against us, nailing it to his CROSS. Let no man therefore judge you in *meat, drink, feast day, or sabbath day*. Let no man rob you of your prize through his voluntary humility, *angel worship* and visions, one who does not hold fast the HEAD from whom all the BODY grows. If ye DIED with Christ to the rudiments of the world, why be subject to prohibitions and asceticism?

[Gentiles] who have been sealed with the *Holy Spirit*.

Having heard of your faith I pray that the God of our Lord Jesus Christ may give you the KNOWLEDGE of him and of his might in raising up Christ and placing him in the *heavenly places* above all POWER and DOMINION and every name that is named, and made him HEAD over ALL THINGS to the Church which is his BODY, the FULLNESS of him that filleth all in all.

Chapter II. And you did he quicken from the death of sin, for his great LOVE, through grace and faith (not works), and raised us up to sit in the *heavenly places* in Christ. In Christ he created us for good works. Ye GENTILES were once ALIENATED from Israel, but Christ, our peace, broke down the wall between us, abolished the ORDINANCES, and RECONCILED both in *one BODY* through the CROSS. Ye are built on the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ being the chief cornerstone.

Chapter III. Paul, prisoner of Christ Jesus for you Gentiles, if ye have heard of my STEWARDSHIP, given to me for you,—the MYSTERY hid in other generations but now revealed unto his *holy apostles and prophets* in the Spirit, that THE GENTILES ARE FELLOW-MEMBERS OF THE BODY and fellow-partakers of the promise in Christ Jesus. Thus through the Church is the wisdom of God, in his eternal purpose in Christ Jesus, made known to the PRINCIPALITIES and the POWERS in the *heavenly places*. I pray that through the power of the Spirit and through Christ, dwelling in your hearts by faith, ye may know the LOVE of Christ which passeth KNOWL-

Chapter III. If ye were RAISED with Christ, seek the things above where the risen Christ is.

Kill, therefore, UNCLEANNESS, evil desire, and COVETOUSNESS, for which things' sake cometh the WRATH of God. PUT AWAY ANGER, SHAMEFUL SPEAKING, AND LYING. In the new man old distinctions of Jew and Greek, bond and free, cannot exist, Christ is all and in all.

Put on kindness and Christ-like forgiveness, and above all LOVE. Let Christ's word and peace dwell in you, as in ONE BODY, teaching and admonishing one another with PSALMS AND HYMNS AND SPIRITUAL SONGS. Do every thing thankfully in the name of the Lord Jesus.

WIVES, be in subjection to your husbands, as is fitting in the Lord.

HUSBANDS, love your wives, and be not bitter against them.

CHILDREN, obey your parents in all things, for this is well-pleasing in the Lord.

FATHERS, provoke not your children, that they be not discouraged.

SERVANTS, obey in all things them that are your masters according to the flesh, ye serve the Lord Christ.

Chapter IV. MASTERS, render unto your servants that which is just and

EDGE, that ye may be filled unto all the FULLNESS of God.

Chapter IV. WALK WORTHILY of your calling in patient love, preserving the unity of the ONE BODY. There is one body, one Spirit, one hope, one Lord, one faith, one baptism, one God. But there are diverse gifts and offices. There are APOSTLES, PROPHETS, EVANGELISTS, PASTORS, TEACHERS—all to build up the body of Christ, till we all attain to the UNITY of the faith and of the KNOWLEDGE of the Son of God, to the FULLNESS of Christ, that we may not be children tossed to and fro by FALSE DOCTRINE but full-grown in Christ. United in Christ as HEAD, the BODY will grow through the loving co-operation of the members.

Walk not as the immoral Gentiles. PUT AWAY FALSEHOOD, ANGER, CORRUPT SPEECH, and all bitterness, UNCLEANNESS, and COVETOUSNESS. Grieve not the Holy Spirit.

Chapter V. WALK IN LOVE, and as children of LIGHT, AS WISE MEN, REDEEMING THE TIME. Be not drunken with wine but filled with the Spirit, speaking one to another in PSALMS AND HYMNS AND SPIRITUAL SONGS, giving thanks always for all things in the name of our Lord Jesus Christ. Be subject one to another.

WIVES, be subject unto your own husbands as unto the Lord, even as the Church is subject to Christ, her head.

HUSBANDS, love your wives as Christ the Church, his body. Twain become one flesh—a great MYSTERY of Christ and the Church.

Chapter VI. CHILDREN, obey your parents in the Lord, for this is right.

FATHERS, provoke not your children to wrath, but nurture them

equal, knowing that ye also have a Master in heaven.

PRAY that God may open to us a door to speak the MYSTERY of Christ for which I am IN BONDS.

WALK IN WISDOM toward those who are without, REDEEMING THE TIME.

TYCHICUS shall tell you my affairs, whom I send with Onesimus.

Aristarchus, Mark, Jesus Justus, and Epaphras (one of you) all salute you. Epaphras prays and labors for you and those in Laodicea and Hierapolis. Luke and Demas salute you.

Salute the brethren in Laodicea, cause that this epistle be read also in the church of the Laodiceans, and that ye also read the epistle from Laodicea.

The salutation of me Paul, with mine own hand. Grace be with you.

in the chastening and admonition of the Lord.

SERVANTS, be obedient unto them that according to the flesh are your masters, as servants of Christ.

MASTERS, do the same things unto them and forbear threatening, their Master and yours is in heaven.

Put on the whole armor of God to struggle against the PRINCIPALITIES, the POWERS, the spiritual hosts of wickedness in the heavenly places.

PRAY that I, an ambassador IN BONDS, may speak the MYSTERY of Christ boldly.

TYCHICUS shall tell you my state.

Divine peace, love, and faith to the brethren.

Grace to all who love our Lord Jesus Christ in incorruptness.

The correspondences of the two epistles are manifest and striking. Prominent among them is the use of the terms *mystery* (μυστήριον), *knowledge* (γνῶσις and ἐπιγνώσις), *fullness* (πλήρωμα), *principalities and powers*, *all*, *head* (referring to Christ), *body* (referring to the Church), *reconcile*, and *walk worthily*.

Of about sixteen hundred words in Colossians more than four hundred agree, often in unbroken successions up to ten, letter for letter with those of Ephesians.* . . . Of the one hundred and fifty-five verses in Ephesians seventy-eight contain expressions identical with those in Colossians.†

In the exhortations to moral purity the parallelism is very close, and in those directed to wives, husbands, children, fathers, servants, and masters, the one epistle may be regarded as a paraphrase of the other.

Of peculiar elements Colossians has definite warnings against false teaching, in connection with which there is reference made to *circumcision*, *sabbath* and *feast days*, and *angel-worship*, and Christ is called the *mystery of God* in whom the *treasures of knowledge* are hid. The exaltation of Christ as *image of*

* Schmiedel in *Ersch und Gruber*, 1885, § ii, 33, p. 139.

† Conybeare and Howson's *St. Paul*, ii, p. 414.

God, chief over all spiritual beings and head of the Church, is dwelt upon. The personal references are full. Epaphras, who first preached the Gospel to them, has brought news of the Colossians to Paul, whom they have never seen. Tychicus and Onesimus carry the letter, which the Colossians are to have read in the Church of the Laodiceans, whose members Paul salutes. The Colossians must themselves read the letter from Laodicea. Six companions of Paul are named as sending salutations.

Turning to the peculiarities of Ephesians, we find *heavenly places* (τὰ ἐπουράνια) singularly prominent, as also are references to the Holy Spirit and to fore-ordination. We are struck by the expressions *holy apostles and prophets, evangelists, pastors, and teachers*. The emphasis of the epistle is laid upon the unity of the Church, the *one body*, the body of Christ. The *mystery* hid in God from other generations, but now revealed through the Church to the principalities and powers, is in accordance with God's eternal purpose, that the Gentiles are with the Jews *fellow-members of the body*. Christ, by his blood, has broken down the dividing wall between the alien Gentiles and the Jews, and reconciled them in one body. Peculiar, also, is the prayer that his readers may "know the love of Christ which passeth knowledge," and the exhortation to "put on the whole armor of God." Paul addresses his hearers as Gentiles of whose faith he had heard (i, 15), who may have heard of his stewardship for them (iii, 2), to whom his letter will be a proof of his understanding in the mystery of Christ (iii, 4). All personal salutations from his companions or to individuals among his readers are wanting. The thanksgiving is general (i, 3, ff.), and so is the benediction (vi, 24). Tychicus, who bears the letter, will tell them of Paul's condition. The style of the letter, which the summary does not represent, is more diffuse than that of Colossians and the conceded epistles, two synonymous words are frequently employed so as to form a "doublet," and the sentences are often long and flowing, as in the First Epistle of Peter.

The comparisons already made show that these two epistles present a complex and literary problem, which is analogous in some respects to that afforded by the synoptical gospels, but otherwise unique in the New Testament.

In reviewing the efforts of the negative criticism to solve

this riddle one is struck by the variety and mutual antagonism of their results. One critic thinks that both epistles are spurious, and written by the same hand. Another, who finds neither genuine, sees clear traces of two periods and two distinct authors. Others, who recognize a genuine kernel in Colossians, do not agree as to what constitutes that kernel. There is, as we have already seen, no harmony among the objectors as to the date of the epistles; their conjectures ranging over a period of seventy years, from A. D. 70 to 140. With reference to the heresy attacked in Colossians, and apparently alluded to in Ephesians, there is the same amazing lack of agreement. It seems to one critic to be Cerinthianism;* to others, Gnostic Ebionitism;† and to others Christianized Essenism, fast becoming Gnosticism.‡ Others still discover well-developed dualistic Gnosticism.§ The latest view advanced is that the heretics of the *genuine* Colossian epistle were Jewish Christians of the Alexandrian type.|| This varied and radical disagreement is of itself a proof that there is no sure ground for the theories proposed. Weizsäcker, who finds Colossians exhibiting the same range of thought as Ephesians, and a similar relation to the historical Paul, says¶ of the Colossian heresy: "We know nothing historically of a system of doctrine which unites in itself all these elements." The heresies referred to, directly and implied in certain terms which Paul apparently adopts from its followers, do not establish any objections to the Pauline authorship of either epistle. There is in it an evident mixture of Jewish and Gentile elements. These are asceticism, angel-worship, insistence upon Jewish observances, speculations concerning the creation, the search for a higher wisdom and fuller knowledge, traditional mysteries and doctrines of a fullness and perfection, which in some way dishonored Christ. The close association of this indicates in itself an early and undeveloped stage of heretical teaching. We have here the germs which grew later into separate systems. These various elements unquestionably existed long before the death of Paul. History affords many examples of the slow and often unnoticed and long-retarded

* Mayerhoff.

† Baur, Hoekstra, and Holtzmann.

‡ Lipsius, etc.

§ Hilgenfeld, etc.

|| Von Soden, in Holtzmann's *Hand-Kommentar, Kolosserbrief*, p. 10. (In press.)¶ *Das Apostolische Zeitalter*, p. 563.

growth of peculiar religious, philosophic, or scientific systems.* The condition of things in Asia Minor seems to have been particularly favorable to these Oriental speculations, which threatened the Colossian and neighboring churches. That Paul should adopt some of the words of this "philosophy" and turn them into weapons for defending the faith is exactly parallel to his treatment of the would-be philosophers of Corinth.† If the heresies indicated in the epistles be called Gnostic, it is of a type so incipient, so "vague and fluctuating,"‡ as to confirm rather than discredit the belief in the Pauline authorship.

The exalted teachings of Colossians and Ephesians concerning the person of Christ have been confidently urged as proof of an author later than Paul. It is said with truth that the Christology is more advanced than in Paul's earlier epistles, and nearer to that of the fourth gospel. Those who regard the latter as a spurious product of the second century§ find it convenient to assume a writer or two writers with intermediate views for these letters. But Paul may be simply expressing his inmost views with a greater freedom and explicitness than before (see 1 Cor. ii, 2, 6), or there may have been a fuller development of the great truth in his own mind. His earlier teachings involve the later. God's wisdom in a mystery was "fore-ordained before the worlds unto our glory" (1 Cor. ii, 7); Christ is the "image of God" (2 Cor. iv, 4); there is "one Lord, Jesus Christ, through whom are all things" (1 Cor. viii, 6); Christ, "though he was rich," became poor for our sakes (1 Cor. viii, 9); grace and peace are sought for the churches from "God our Father and from the Lord Jesus Christ." It has been well said|| that the "main conception of the person of Christ, as enforced in the Colossian epistle alone, justifies and explains" such

* Huxley traces the doctrine of evolution back to beginnings in the views of Aristotle, and in the writings of Harvey (in the seventeenth century). He finds it hard to say "whether Lamarck or Treviranus has the priority in propounding the main thesis of evolution;" yet both wrote near the end of the eighteenth century. Yet in an age of cheap printed books the theory of evolution seems inseparably connected with the name of Darwin, who published his *Natural Selection* in 1858. He says also that De Maillet, in 1735, "clearly apprehends the cardinal maxim of modern geological science." *Encyc. Brit.*, viii, p. 748.

† 1 Cor. i, 21, 30; ii, 4, 7.

‡ Lightfoot, *Colossians and Philemon*, pp. 71, ff., and 255, ff.

§ See Professor Crooks's article in this *Review*, January, 1891.

|| Lightfoot, *Colossians and Philemon*, p. 120.

teachings as these of the earlier letters. Whether we regard the fuller teaching as lofty deduction or necessary development, the fact of Paul's authorship is decisive.

While Colossians lays chief stress upon Christ as Head of the Church, Ephesians emphasizes the unity of the Church which is his body. But it is objected that Paul, in his unquestioned epistles, speaks almost without exception of individual churches, not of *the Church* as one body. But the earlier epistles prove that the conception of the Church as a collective unity was not unfamiliar to him.* He never recognized any distinction between Jewish and Gentile Christians which should prevent them from uniting in one body. He received the right hand of fellowship from James, Cephas, and John (Gal. ii, 9) in Jerusalem; he urged his Gentile converts to give liberally for the saints in the Holy City (2 Cor. ix, 3, etc.), assuring them that the brethren in Jerusalem would praise God for their obedience to the Gospel, and "long after them by reason of the exceeding grace of God" in them (2 Cor. ix, 14). He says: "There can be neither Jew nor Greek, . . . for ye are all one in Christ Jesus" (Gal. iii, 28); "Ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof" (1 Cor. xii, 27); "We, who are many," he writes to the distant Romans, "are one body in Christ" (Rom. xii, 5). We have in Colossians and Ephesians a mere application of these principles. It is not surprising that after years have passed, in writing to communities of Gentile Christians whose few Jewish members appear to be more under the influence of Alexandrian philosophy than of Judean fanaticism, he makes no meaningless allusions to past conflicts, but rather, viewing the work from afar, from the capital city of the one great empire, he applies the principles he had before enunciated, and exhorts his readers to preserve the unity of the Church. The unity, the predestinated glory of the Church, from which Christ has removed all national barriers to closest union, forms a theme both worthy of Paul and consistent with what we know of his views. The expression "the body of Christ" is a fitting counterpart to "Head of the Church." From whom, if not from Paul, could we expect a development of his fundamental principles so noble and so consistent?

There remains to be considered the literary relationship be-

*Gal. i, 13; 1 Cor. xii, 28, etc.

tween the two epistles and the peculiarities in the style and vocabulary of Ephesians. With many variations in detail, negative critics now generally agree that literary dependence is to be charged against Ephesians. Yet Holtzmann claims to show that more than one half of Colossians was added by the unknown author of Ephesians after he had composed the latter epistle. One writer* fills two hundred packed and bristling pages with a minute investigation of every important clause in both epistles. Pains-taking dissection cannot go further. It is conceded among the results that Ephesians is written in the spirit of Paul, and abounds in figures, constructions, and expressions similar to those of the conceded epistles. Indeed, this is turned against its genuineness. It is *too thoroughly* Pauline! It is a mosaic made up of numberless fine bits from the great epistles, of great masses from Colossians, and of a few original additions of a Pauline stamp, and the whole is arranged in a unique pattern, which is also Pauline, but too fully "developed" for Paul himself!† The Colossian elements, as we have seen, are in some portions bold, full, flagrant for an imitator; again, they are intricately combined, and applied to new ends. The coincidences with other epistles are almost countless and often very subtle. The original portions are striking and worthy of Paul. One who could produce them had no need to be an imitator. One so thoroughly saturated with all Paul's writings had no need to use Colossians so recklessly. One who could write this epistle must have buried his *ten* talents in the earth before and afterward, since we have nothing else from his mighty pen, and no shadow of a tradition preserves his great name, though he is supposed to have lived in an age when great men in the Church were few—few, that is, except as the negative critics, robbing the apostolic age, the creative era, of all able writers except Paul, have enriched it with a Christian philosopher to write the fourth gospel, another to write Hebrews, a poet to compose the third gospel and Acts, and other gifted "pseudo-graphic" authors for the Catholic Epistles. But an imitator

* Dr. H. von Soden, *Jahrbücher für protestantische Theologie*, 1885, 1887.

† See, for example, Weizsäcker, p. 562; Pfleiderer, p. 435; Holtzmann, p. 21. Von Soden, for example, in dissecting Eph. iii, 6-19, finds, if I count right, twenty-five distinct "reminiscences" of Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, and Philippians; portions of Colossians are adopted in six instances, while five verses are entirely original.

of the apostles at once so servile and so original as the supposed author of Ephesians is not elsewhere known. Where is the product of imitation which combines such singular characteristics? We may safely challenge the objectors to produce its like from existing literature, or to create one from their own knowledge of Paul's works. It is very common for a man to repeat himself, in whole or in part, in writing and speaking. Every careful observer of such things knows this. It is not difficult to imagine Paul writing two letters which supplement each other to readers in the same general circumstances, at about the same time, in which the same store of terms is employed, even in "successions up to ten words each," especially if each letter has its own organized and distinct teaching. It would not be an unnatural or alarming supposition that in dictating the second letter, under pressure of haste, weariness, or illness, he had the first at hand, and, when occasion justified, made such use of it as he could. Men very jealous of their literary reputation frequently follow this method, and Paul wrote with "far other than literary aims." This supposition that Paul wrote both letters must be regarded as the most reasonable unless the peculiarities in style and phraseology in Ephesians are such as to discredit it.

Such peculiarities in its composition constitute the final and most trusted intrenchment of the opposition. Yet the details seem strangely trivial when viewed, not through the spectacles of near-sighted specialists, but without prejudice in the light of actual daily life. The fallacy of the objection lies in the premises. It seems to be assumed that Paul quite exhausted his thoughts and his vocabulary in the four great epistles, and that his words should always take shape in the same grammatical mold. But few lives have seen more vicissitudes or been subject to so varied influences, and few minds have been more susceptible and versatile. Style and vocabulary are peculiarly subject to change when one is not using his mother-tongue. Paul, for the first time in Rome, was amid novel and stimulating influences. Soldiers, state officials, members of the local churches, visitors from far and near, would inspire fresh thought and furnish new expressions. Here is a marvelous scope of old and new impressions. Any day a believer might ask him to explain some passage from his Epistle to the Romans, or from those to the Corinthians,

or might bring instead some new hymn which had been just introduced into the developing liturgy of the metropolitan churches (Eph. v, 14). Who shall say how many old or new words Paul should use in any one of the comparatively few and brief examples of his teachings which represent the vast compass of his thought and expression during years of ardent evangelism? Yet it is objected that in this epistle he five times uses the new expression "heavenly places," and says "devil"* twice!

Among other words not found in the unquestioned epistles are *μεθοδεία*, *deceit*; *δέσμιος*, *prisoner*; *φρόνησις*, *prudence*; *κοσμοκράτορες*, *world-rulers*. It is thought "surprising" that Paul has not used these words before if it is he who uses them here. They seem to me, on the contrary, to be most natural additions to his vocabulary in a Roman imprisonment.† It is objected further, that this epistle speaks of "loving the Lord Jesus Christ" (vi, 24), while Paul speaks of "loving God" (Rom. viii, 28, etc.), and that we have here "the Father of glory," in the place of "the Lord of glory" (1 Cor. ii, 8). Paul does not elsewhere speak of "the holy Church" and "the holy apostles and prophets," nor of "evangelists and pastors" as officers in the Church, nor of "doing the will of God."

We have sought to present, in text and note, the most important objections of this sort; but though they are gravely rehearsed by the critics as formidable, it really does not seem necessary to reply to more than one or two. There is no phrase among them all which was not entirely possible to Paul. The common use of several of them in a later period can easily have sprung from his example. Others, which assumed at length a technical character, must have been used first in a general way. The expression "holy apostles and prophets" is, however, surprising. If it stood in the way of a radical critic's theory he would make short work of it as an interpolation, and in this

* *Διάβολος* instead of *σατανᾶς*.

† Further objections under this head are that *ἀγάπη μετὰ πίστεως*, *love with faith*, is here mentioned, while Paul in Galatians (v, 6) speaks of *πίστις δι' ἀγάπης*, *faith through love*; that in other epistles Paul does not speak of "the God of our Lord Jesus Christ" (i, 17), nor "the prince of the power of the air," nor of a "wind of doctrine," nor of "the day of redemption" (iv, 30). He says, instead of the latter, "the day of the Lord" (1 Cor. v, 5). Here it is, "Ye have been saved" (ii, 5, 8), elsewhere "are saved" (1 Cor. xv, 2). Paul never uses *εἰς πάσας τὰς γενέας τοῦ αἰῶνος τῶν αἰώνων*, *unto all the generations forever and ever*.

case he could certainly show some ground for such a supposition. "Holy" could easily and unconsciously have slipped in in this connection from the pen of a careful and honest copyist a few decades after the death of Paul.* Since the term *saints*, ἅγιοι (holy ones), was the most common expression of Paul for believers in general, the word "holy" cannot have had in every connection for him the high and special significance which it attained in a later time, and has for us.

Of words occurring but once in the New Testament, the so-called *hapax legomena*, Ephesians has forty-three. But since 2 Corinthians, for example, has ninety-nine, it would be, as Reuss says, "shrewder" for objectors to keep silence about them.† On the other hand, it is worthy of consideration that in this brief epistle there are no less than eighteen words which are found elsewhere only in the Pauline writings.

But the Christian Church has a right to protest, in the interest of true science as well as of religion, against the confidence which the higher critics in general place in this sort of evidence. Though not to be wholly discredited, it is always precarious. The recent attacks upon all the Pauline epistles may prove serviceable by the very absurdity of the conclusion to which this evidence may lead.‡ The laws which govern the use of terms by a given writer have never been formulated. They involve subtle associations, occult causes, the influence of immediate surroundings, mental conditions, and states of health. The uncertainty of the resulting composition is especially great when a non-professional writer treats a new subject amid strange surroundings, and in addressing new hearers.

Erasmus is said to have noticed that the style of Ephesians is peculiar. Schleiermacher, on the ground of a similar observation, conjectured that Tychicus wrote the epistle at Paul's

* This adjective made its way into Rev. xxii, 6, in the Received Text before the word "prophets." "Holy brethren" is perhaps the true reading in 1 Thess. v, 27, and it occurs at any rate in Heb. iii, 1, as "holy women" does in 1 Pet. iii, 5.

† Of *hapax legomena* Romans has 113, 1 Corinthians 110, Galatians 34, Philipians 41, and Colossians 38.

‡ This *reductio ad absurdum* has been applied to Romans, in the spirit of Trench's *Historic Doubts*, in a pamphlet lately published by T. and T. Clark, *Romans Dissected*. The *nom de plume* E. D. McRealsham veils the name of a distinguished American scholar, who divides Romans up between four authors whose distinctive styles, favorite words, and doctrinal views are established (?) by critical methods.

request, using Colossians as a model; and Ewald, that in it Timothy may be giving expression to thoughts of Paul. Negative critics have dwelt much upon the peculiarities of style. They find large portions of the epistle tautological and heavy. They call attention to long sentences* with members strung loosely together by means of participles and relative pronouns. They point out a tendency to heap up synonyms and modifying genitives. And compare this with the sharp, emphatic style and lively dialectic of the earlier epistles. The contrast has, doubtless, been too strongly emphasized; but there are unquestionably certain peculiarities which distinguish it from other epistles. Reasons for these can be conjectured, but cannot here be given.

The problem receives additional light from the high probability that this epistle was not addressed exclusively to the Ephesians. Its general character, lack of personal messages and references, its apparent allusion to its readers as personally unknown (iii, 2-4), and its less definite style, are more consistent with the view supported by external testimony and now generally adopted by conservative scholars, that this was intended as an encyclical letter.† It is then to be regarded as the "epistle from Laodicea" (Col. iv, 16), whither a copy of it was to be taken by Tychicus.

The epistle may not be considered as withdrawn from the fire of hostile criticism, but it is enduring the severest tests, and will, doubtless, be confidently retained by the Church and cherished among its richest treasures.

* Eph. i, 3-14, is one sentence; iii, 1-12, contains but two. This is said to be more like the style of 1 Peter than of Paul's epistles. But see Rom. i, 1-7, and 2 Cor. vi, 1-10, for long sentences, and 2 Cor. iv, 6, for the heaping up of genitives.

† The words *ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* in the salutation are not in the oldest and best manuscripts, the Vatican and Sinaitic. They were not read by Marcion, Tertullian, Origen, Basil, and Jerome. Westcott and Hort say (Int., p. 302): "If there were here, as usual, a simple issue of genuineness or spuriousness, the words would have to be condemned." Still they print the words in peculiar type, inclosed in brackets, because a letter addressed to a plurality of churches "might leave a blank space, to be filled up in each case with a different local address. *Ἐν Ἐφέσῳ* would then be a "legitimate but unavoidably partial supplement to the true text" (Appen., p. 123, f.).

Charles F. Bradley.

ART. II.—TATIAN'S DIATESSARON.

THE publication of a Latin translation of the Commentary of Ephraem the Syrian on the *Diatessaron* of Tatian, made by George Moesinger from the Armenian language, and the recent publication of an Arabic text of the *Diatessaron* itself, accompanied with a Latin translation by P. A. Ciasca, have awakened fresh interest in this most ancient harmony of the four gospels.

Tatian was a disciple of Justin Martyr, but after the death of that Christian philosopher he abandoned the Orthodox Church and became the leader of an heretical ascetic sect called *Encratites*. Tatian was born in Assyria, and Jerome * tells us that he flourished in the reign of the emperors M. Antonius Verus and L. Aurelius Commodus (A. D. 161-192). Commodus became sole emperor in A. D. 180, and it is impossible to say during how much of his reign Tatian lived; and consequently the date of his death is not fixed by Jerome, nor do we know any good authority that does fix it. Nor is the date of the death of Justin Martyr, Tatian's master, definitely determined, but fluctuates between A. D. 148 and A. D. 167, though, as Dr. Lightfoot remarks, "the most careful investigations of recent criticism have tended toward a much earlier date"† than A. D. 163-165. Dr. Lightfoot infers‡ from Irenæus, lib. i, cap. xxviii, 1, that at the date of that book—some time before A. D. 190, or, possibly, before A. D. 178—Tatian was already dead. But to us such an inference is not very clear or even very probable. It is not at all likely that Tatian composed his *Diatessaron* before the death of Justin Martyr and his own return to Syria or Assyria, his native land. Its composition in the Syriac language, and its circulation, principally, at least, in the regions of Mesopotamia, would indicate this. On the other hand, it was most probably composed before Tatian became a heretic and condemned marriage as an abomination and rejected the use of wine. For how otherwise can the fact be explained that he introduced into his *Diatessaron* || the account of Christ's

* *Liber de Illus. Viris*, cap. xxix.

† *Essays on Supernatural Religion*, p. 274.

‡ *Supernatural Religion*, p. 274.

§ This seems quite certain.

|| In both Ephraem's Commentary and in Ciasca's text of the *Diatessaron*.

being present at the marriage in Cana of Galilee and then converting water into wine. But while we cannot determine the date of the *Diatessaron* with certainty, it may with great probability be referred to some time in the period A. D. 160-170.

The first witness to Tatian's having composed a *diatessaron* is Eusebius, Bishop of Cæsarea Palestinæ (about A. D. 315-340). He says:

Tatian, having formed a combination and collection of the gospels, I know not how,* he called it the (Gospel) by Four,† which still now circulates among some.

The natural inference from his language is that he had no *personal* knowledge of the work. Nor is this strange, since it is not likely that the *Diatessaron* was in use at Cæsarea; and even if Eusebius had found a copy of the work it is very doubtful that he could have read it, as we are not aware that he had a knowledge of Syriac. But the statement of Eusebius is sufficient to establish the fact that Tatian composed such a work. For if every thing of which the historian himself is not a witness is to be called in question, but little trustworthy history is left for us.

Epiphanius, who became Bishop of Constantia, the metropolis of the isle of Cyprus, about A. D. 367, remarks of Tatian:

It is said that the *Diatessaron* was composed by him, which some call the (Gospel) according to the Hebrews.‡

The *Diatessaron* certainly bore no resemblance to the Gospel according to the Hebrews, which must have agreed substantially with our Matthew, as Jerome,§ who translated the book into Greek, testifies.

Our next and most important witness to the *Diatessaron* is Theodoret, who about A. D. 420 became Bishop of Cyrrhestica, a district of eastern Syria, north-east of Antioch, bordering on

* Bishop Lightfoot does not consider the language of Eusebius as implying that he had no *personal* knowledge of the work, but as equivalent to "unaccountably," "absurdly," and in proof of this meaning he refers to various passages in Origen's work against Celsus, p. 278. But it would have been more satisfactory if he had given us some clear passages from Eusebius himself in proof of this usage.

† 'Ο Τατιανὸς συνάγειν τινα καὶ συναγωγὴν οὐκ οἶδ' ὅπως τῶν Εὐαγγελίων συνθεῖ, τὸ Διατεσσάρων τοῦτο προσωνόμασεν (*Hist. Eccl.*, lib. iv, 150).

‡ Hær., lib. i, tom. iii, Hæresis xlv.

§ *Lib. de Illus. Vir. Mat.*

the Euphrates, containing eight hundred parishes. This eminent ecclesiastical writer remarks on Tatian:

This man composed the gospel called, that by Four, having cut off both the genealogies and the other things which show that the Lord was born of the seed of David according to the flesh. Not only did those who were of his party use it, but also those who follow the apostolic doctrines, not knowing the fraudulent character of the composition, but having used the book in a very simple way as an epitome. I also found more than two hundred such books held in honor in the churches among us, and having collected them all, I removed them and substituted for them the Gospels of the Four Evangelists.*

This testimony to the existence, nature, and circulation of the *Diatessaron* is decisive. Its name was equivalent to the English "A Harmony of the Four Gospels." From Theodoret's statement it does not appear to have contained matter from any other source than our four gospels. The work was simply an abridgment. As Justin Martyr, Tatian's master, used our four gospels† as authorities, and them only, it was natural that Tatian should do the same. We have proof of his use of John's gospel in the following passages of his "Oration to the Greeks:"

God is a Spirit,‡ This is that which is said: "The darkness comprehends not the light."§ All things by him (were made), and without him has been made not even one thing.||

After the removal of the *Diatessaron* from the churches in the diocese of Theodoret copies of the work seem to have become scarce, and the work itself almost forgotten. Victor, Bishop of Capua, A. D. 545, found a harmony of the four gospels without any title, which he supposed to be the *Diatessaron* of Tatian.¶

* *Hæret. Fabular. Compendium*, lib. i, cap. xx.

† Strauss concedes that Justin used our first three gospels (*Das Leben Jesu*, pp. 56, 57, 1874). Hilgenfeld, a distinguished rationalistic critic, acknowledges that Justin used all four (*Einleitung*, pp. 65-67, 1875).

‡ Πνεῦμα ὁ Θεός, sec. 4, the exact language and order of words in John iv, 24.

§ Ἡ σκοτία τὸ φῶς καταλαμβάνει, sec. 13. This manifestly refers to John i, 5: "and the darkness comprehended it not."

|| Πάντα ἐπ' αὐτοῦ καὶ χωρὶς αὐτοῦ γέγονεν οὐδὲ ἓν, sec. 19, with reference to John i, 3. The old Curetorean Syriac also ends the verse with "one thing." "Which was made" is joined to the next verse.

¶ We shall discuss this work in another place.

Barsalibi, Bishop of Amida in Mesopotamia, in the twelfth century, states that Tatian composed one gospel from the four, which he called *Diatessaron*. St. Ephraem wrote comments on this book, and followed the order of the *Diatessaron*.^{*} According to Barsalibi the *Diatessaron* began thus: "In the beginning was the Word."

This commentary of Ephraem, preserved in the Armenian language in two codices about seven hundred years old, bears the title, "THE EXPOSITION OF THE HARMONY OF THE GOSPELS, MADE BY SAINT EPHRAEM, THE SYRIAN DOCTOR." This work was translated into Latin by J. B. Aucher in 1841, and a revised translation was published by Georgius Moesinger at Venice in 1876. The *Diatessaron* corresponds to the description given of it by Theodoret and Barsalibi, and is no doubt Tatian's work. No information respecting the language in which it was composed has come down to us so far as we know. Yet, as it was intended for circulation in a region in which the Syriac was the vernacular, it is very probable that it was written in that language, and may have been taken from the original Syriac version in general use in the churches. It is possible, however, that we have not in Ephraem's Commentary the original form of the text of the *Diatessaron*, but the modified text made to conform to the common Syriac version of Ephraem's time.[†]

In 1888 P. A. Ciasca, secretary of the Vatican Library, published at Rome an Arabic text of the *Diatessaron* from two codices, accompanied with a Latin translation. One of the Arabic codices which he had found in the Vatican was mutilated; but in 1886 Antonius Morcos, apostolic visitor of the Catholic Copts, being on a visit to Rome, informed Ciasca of the existence of another Arabic copy of this work in the hands of a Roman Catholic in Egypt, which he caused to be sent to Ciasca the same year. This manuscript, which Ciasca thinks is at least as old as the fourteenth century, consisting of three hundred and fifteen pages, enabled him to supply the defects of his Arabic text in the Vatican. In the superscription to the Arabic text it is stated that the book is called *Diatessaron*,

^{*} Assemani, *Bib. Orien.*, vol. i, p. 57. In an apocryphal Syriac work relating to founding of Christianity, the new converts are represented as assembling "to hear read, along with the Old Testament, the New (Testament) of the *Diatessaron*." The work containing this statement, Dr. Lightfoot thinks, may belong to the third century.

[†] From my paper on "Cureton's Fragments of Syriac Gospels," published in *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis* for December, 1885, pp. 28-48.

which Tatian, a Greek, compiled from the four gospels. A very learned presbyter, Ben-at-Tib, translated it from Syriac into Arabic. According to Assemani this Ben-at-Tib died A. D. 1043. Ciasca has ascertained that the writer of the Syriac manuscript which Ben-at-Tib translated into Arabic was 'Isa ben Ali Almotattabbe, who died at Hira A. D. 873.

The *Diatessaron* commences with "In the beginning was the Word," and continues with the first five verses of John's gospel, followed by Luke i, 5-80, and Matt. i, 18-25; the book ends with John xxi, 25. The whole is divided into fifty-five chapters. According to our calculation the work contains about seventy-seven per cent. of Matthew, about fifty per cent. of Mark, seventy-five per cent. of Luke, and ninety per cent. of John. It lacks the genealogies * of Matthew and Luke just as Theodoret states of Tatian's *Diatessaron*.† Here the question arises, What relation does the text of the Commentary of Ephraem hold to this newly discovered *Diatessaron*? We have already seen that Barsalibi states that Ephraem followed the order of the *Diatessaron*. A careful comparison of the order of Ephraem's text with that of Ciasca's *Diatessaron* shows us in almost every instance that it is the same. And although the Commentary of Ephraem contains only a small portion of the *Diatessaron*, the passages are numerous enough to show that this agreement in order could not be accidental. Furthermore, Ephraem's text is Syriac, and nearly the same, it would seem, as the old Syriac text‡ of which fragments of the gospels were published by Cureton in 1858.

We shall now proceed to show that Ciasca's Arabic text of the *Diatessaron* is really a translation of the Syriac from the numerous passages in which it agrees with the Peshito, but differs from the Greek, and that the Arabic text also contains

* We are not sure that Tatian left out the genealogies on dogmatic grounds. He may have deemed them of no special importance.

† The superscription of the Arabic translation states that the sign of what is taken from Matthew is M; of that taken from Mark is R; of that taken from Luke is C; and of that taken from John is H. But the present Arabic text has not these letters, but the names of the evangelists prefixed from whom they are taken. These names are transferred to the Latin translation.

‡ This is indicated by the passages in Ephraem's Commentary agreeing with the Curetonian text, but differing from the Greek and Peshito. On pp. 116, 117, Ephraem, after quoting, "I thank thee, heavenly Father," adds: "He says in Greek, I thank thee, God, Father, Lord of heaven and earth" (Matt. xi, 25).

vestiges of the old Curetonian text of the Syriac gospels. The following readings are manifestly taken from the Peshito Syriac. In Luke ii, 1, we have, "That all the people of his dominion should be enrolled,"* exactly as the Peshito. The Greek is, "That all the world should enroll itself." Cana of Galilee is called in the *Diatessaron*, *Qatna*† (John ii, 1, 11, iv, 46, xx, 1, 2), just as in the Peshito, but different from the Greek and from the other ancient versions. In Luke v, 10, the *Diatessaron* has, "Thou shalt be catching men to life," just like the Peshito. The Greek is, "Thou shalt catch men." In the *Diatessaron*, Luke v, 33, the reading is "fast *perpetually*," like the Syriac. The Greek is, "fast *often*." In Mark ii, 22, we have in the *Diatessaron* added to the Greek text the words, "but new wine ought to be put into new bottles," about the same as the Peshito, "but they put new wine into new bottles." In Mark ii, 26, the *Diatessaron* has, "He did eat the bread of the table of the Lord," just as the Peshito. The Greek has, "the show bread." "Behold my servant, in whom I have been well pleased" (Matt. xii, 18), just like the Peshito, but different from the Greek. "Nor cut off the hope of any one" (Luke vi, 35), the same as in the Peshito; the Greek is different. "Shall reward thee openly" (Matt. vi, 4, 6), just as in the Syriac, but "openly" is wanting in the Greek.

The *Diatessaron* contains the doxology to the Lord's Prayer (Matt. vi, 13), "For thine is the kingdom, and the power, and the glory, for ever and ever," just as in the Peshito, but lacking the amen. The doxology is wanting in the oldest Greek manuscripts and in copies of the oldest Latin version and in the Memphitic. "Neither let your mind be disturbed on this account" (Luke xii, 29). Peshito, "Let not your mind be disturbed by these things." But the Greek is, "Be ye not in suspense." In Mark iv, 39, the *Diatessaron* represents Christ as saying to the sea, "Be quiet, thou art admonished." The Peshito reads, "Be quiet, thou art reproved." The Greek is, "Be quiet, be speechless." In Luke viii, 26, the *Diatessaron* has, "The Hadarenes" (Gadarenes), like the Peshito and the Curetonian Fragments. But Tischendorf's Greek text has "Gergesenes," and the old Latin substantially the same.

The *Diatessaron* has in Luke viii, 29, in reference to the

* Page 2, *Diatessaron*.

† Syriac, *Qātne* or *Qotne*.

man possessed of the devil, "He was a long time in the captivity of that one," quite like the Syriac, "For it was a long time since he had been led captive by him" (the devil), but different from the Greek. The *Diatessaron* has, "Neither a wallet nor bread," in the same order as the Peshito; but the Greek is, "Neither bread nor a wallet" (Mark vi, 8). The *Diatessaron* in Luke xi, 23, reads, "He certainly scatters." There is nothing in the Greek to correspond to "certainly." "Certainly" evidently is given as the translation of the participle combined with the infinitive (to scatter) to give intensity of action, as found in the Peshito.

In Matt. xiv, 24, the *Diatessaron* reads, "And the ship was distant from the land many stadia," just as in the Peshito. The Greek is, "The ship was in the midst of the sea." The *Diatessaron* has in John iv, 7, "Give me water that I may drink," like the Peshito. "Water" is wanting in the Greek. The account of the angel troubling the pool of water (John v, 3, 4) is found in the *Diatessaron* in the form which it has in the Peshito, though the passage is wanting in the oldest Greek MSS., in the Curetonian Syriac, the Sahidic Version, and Schwartze's Memphitic MSS. In the *Diatessaron* (Luke ix, 34) it reads, "And when they saw Moses and Elias enter the cloud, they again feared," based evidently upon the Peshito, but differing from the Greek. In the *Diatessaron* (Mark ix, 29) occurs, "except by fasting and prayer," as in the Peshito; but "fasting" is wanting in the oldest Greek. In Luke xv, 25, in the *Diatessaron*, we read, "He heard the voice of the singing of many," just as in the Peshito. The Greek is, "music and dancing." In the *Diatessaron*, in Luke xii, 48, it reads, "required at his hand." The latter part of this is like the Peshito, but different from the Greek. At the end of Luke xvii, 9, the *Diatessaron* has, "I think not," just as the Peshito, but wanting in the oldest Greek and in the Curetonian Fragments. The language of the *Diatessaron* in Matt. xxii, 23, is, "They said unto him, To the dead there is no life." This seems to be based upon the Peshito. In the *Diatessaron* (Luke xx, 35) it is stated, "They will neither take wives nor will women be given to men," like the Peshito, but different from the Greek. In John ix, 11, in the *Diatessaron* it is said, "Go, and wash in the water of Siloam." Peshito, "in the waters of Siloam." The

Greek is, "to Siloam," without "waters." In Luke ix, 54-56, the *Diatessaron* has the long form of these verses as found in the Peshito, old Latin, and in King James's Version, but not in the Revised Version, based on the best Greek texts.

In the *Diatessaron*, at the end of Luke xxi, 11, is added, "great rains." This is manifestly taken from the Syriac, as it occurs both in the Peshito and in the old Curetonian Syriac Fragments in the form "great storms," and is wanting in the Greek. Luke xxii, 43, 44, are found in the *Diatessaron* just as in the Peshito and the old Curetonian Fragments, but is omitted in the Sahidic Version and in the Memphitic MSS. of Schwartz, and in some Greek MSS. In the *Diatessaron*, in John xix, 11, occurs, "His sin is greater than thine," just like the Peshito, but different from the form of the Greek. In Matt. xxvii, 9, in the *Diatessaron* we have the addition Jeremiah to "the prophet," just as in the Peshito and in the old Latin, but in the Greek the prophet is nameless.

We see from the foregoing readings of the *Diatessaron* that its text is largely based upon the Peshito Syriac Version of the gospels. We must also add that we find in the *Diatessaron* vestiges of the old Syriac version which was the basis of the Peshito. Specimens of this old Syriac text are found in Cureton's Fragments of Syriac gospels belonging to about the fifth century.

We give the following passages in the *Diatessaron*, which are manifestly from this old version. In Luke x, 16, in the *Diatessaron* occurs :

Who hears you, hears me, and who hears me, hears him that sent me; but who despiseth you, despiseth me, and who despiseth me, despiseth him who sent me.

The old Curetonian Syriac has the following :

He who hears you, hears me; and he who rejects you, rejects me, and he who rejects me, rejects him who sent me; and he who hears me, hears him that sent me.

Both passages are the same, with the exception that the last part of the verse is not in its natural order, just as in the old ante-Jerome Latin. The Greek text of the passage is :

He who heareth you, heareth me, and he who rejecteth you, rejecteth me; but he that rejecteth me, rejecteth him who sent me.

The form of the passage in the Curetonian Syriac is manifestly the older, and the text of the *Diatessaron* is a correction of the unnatural order of the words in the old Syriac. The Peshito agrees with the Greek. In the *Diatessaron*, in Luke xi, 52, the reading is, "Woe to you lawyers, because ye hide the keys of knowledge." This is also the reading of the old Curetonian Fragments of the fifth century, but it is not found in any Greek text so far as we know, except in the *Codex Bezae** of the first part of the sixth century, introduced likely from the old ante-Jerome Latin. The Greek is, "Ye have taken," just as in the Peshito. This reading is, doubtless, a remnant of the old Syriac. In the *Diatessaron*, Luke xxiv, 32, the reading is, "Was not our heart *heavy* in us?" instead of, "Was not our heart *burning* in us?" as in the Greek and in the Peshito. But the old Curetonian Syriac agrees with the *Diatessaron*, and reads, "Was not our heart heavy?" This reading we can find nowhere except in Woide's *Sahidic Fragments*.† It is manifest that the reading "heavy" in the *Diatessaron* was taken from the old Syriac. It seems to have originated in some Syriac copyist mistaking *yaqīd*, *burning*, for *yaqīr*, *heavy*, the only difference between the two words being that the first Syriac word has a point under the last letter, while the second, "heavy," has a point over that letter.

In a few instances in the *Diatessaron* words and phrases occur which, so far as we know, are found nowhere else. In the midst of Mark vi, 2, the words, "And many envied him, and did not pay attention to him," are interpolated. In Luke iv, 24, we have the addition "among his brethren." In Mark vii, 13, in addition to the Greek text, we have, "And ye have taught precepts about the washing of cups and tables." In Matt. xvi, 12, there is added to the Greek text, "Which he called bread," found nowhere else, as far as we know. "Who had come to the feast" is in John vii, 12, but not in the Greek nor Syriac. More is said on the splendor of the Jewish temple than we find in our gospels: "They showed him both its beauty and its magnificence" (in Matt. xxiv, 1); "and the strength of the stones used in it, and the elegance of its structure" (Mark xiii, 1); "and how it was adorned with precious stones and

* Έκρίψατε is the reading instead of the correct Greek, ἤρατε.

† *Codex Bezae* has κεκαλυμμενη, covered.

beautiful colors" (Luke xxi, 5). In John xviii, 1, there is added, "Gethsemane situated at the mountain." In the account of Christ's trial the following occurs :

But when the morning approaches, all the guards of the temple, the chief priests and scribes and elders of the people assembled, and the whole crowd laying snares.

This passage corresponds neither with Luke xxii, 66, nor with Matt. xxvii, 1, nor with any passage in Mark or John. At the end of John xxi, 12, in reference to Christ's appearance to his disciples, occurs the following: "But he did not appear to them in his own form." This addition we can find nowhere else, and it is impossible to conjecture whence it was derived. It seems to be nothing more than the remark of some copyist. In Mark vii, 26, the Syrophenician woman is said to be of Emesa, in Syria; and in Luke iv, 27, Naaman is called a Nabathæan. There is but little in the *Diatessaron* not found in the best Greek texts of the gospels. We find nowhere any indications of the use of apocryphal gospels by the author of the *Diatessaron*. The work is manifestly composed of our four gospels alone as authorities. The account of the woman taken in adultery (John viii, 1-11) has no place in the *Diatessaron*, as might be expected, since this section made no part of John in the old Syriac, Peshito, and Philoxenian versions of the New Testament. From the examination of the text we cannot agree with the statement of Ciasca :

Certainly nothing prevents us from saying that the *Diatessaron* itself exhibits the text such as it was in the fourth century, or in the time of St. Ephraem.*

For, as we have shown, the text of the *Diatessaron* is based largely upon the text of the Peshito,† and exhibits a later revision.

It remains for us to inquire what relation exists between the *Diatessaron* of Tatian and the Harmony of the Four Gospels found by Victor, Bishop of Capua, A. D. 545, and placed at the head of his Latin edition of the New Testament. This Harmony, according to our calculations, contains about three fourths of the four gospels, about ninety-two per cent. of Mat-

* Preface, p. 13.

† That the Peshito is based upon the Curetonian text, of which it is a revision, see the proof in my paper in the *Journal of the Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis*, December, 1885, pp. 28-48.

thew, and ninety-four per cent. of John, the other gospels being heavily abridged. Victor says it was without title, and the question was whether it should be ascribed to Ammonius of Alexandria or to Tatian the Assyrian. He, however, decides in favor of the latter. The text as we now have it is in Latin, following almost invariably word for word the *Codex Amiatinus*,* containing Jerome's revised translation of the gospels as published by Tregelles, with his Greek text of the gospels. Victor does not state whether he found the Harmony in Latin or translated it from Greek. He says, however, that he has taken pains to affix the Eusebian numbers in the proper places. It would seem strange, then, if he had translated the work, that he should make no mention of this fact. *

Comparing these two Harmonies we find that the first four chapters of Ciasca's Tatian correspond in matter and order with the first eight pages (or columns) of Victor's Harmony, with the exception that Ciasca's Tatian begins with John i, 1, while that of Victor begins with the preface to Luke's gospel, and contains the genealogy as found in Matthew and the genealogy in Luke iii, 34-38, both of which are wanting in Ciasca's Tatian. John i, 7-28, stands connected in Ciasca, while in Victor, Matt. iii, 4-10, then Luke iii, 10-15, are interpolated between John i, 18 and 19; then follows in Victor John i, 19-28, after which comes Matt. iii, 11, 12, in the midst of which stands, "There is among you one whom ye know not," taken from John i, 26. After this we have John i, 28. In Ciasca's Tatian the verses from Matthew and Luke interpolated in John i, 19-27, are placed afterward. Next we have in Ciasca's Tatian Luke iii, 16-18, omitted in Victor, followed by Matt. iii, 13, both in Ciasca and Victor. Next we have in both Harmonies Luke ii, 23, but in Victor Matt. iii, 14, 15, is added to this passage, but omitted in Ciasca. Next we have in Ciasca John i, 29-31, but in Victor Luke iii, 21, 22. Next we have in Victor John i, 32-34, but in Ciasca we have Matt. iii, 14, 15; Luke iii, 21^b; Matt. iii, 16^b; Luke iii, 22^a; and Matt. iii, 17, placed before John i, 32-34.

* This *Codex* must differ but little from that of *Amiatinus*. Both were executed about the same time. Professor Hemphill remarks: "The Latin Harmony as it now exists in the *Codex Fuldensis*, represents not the Harmony as it was found by Victor, but the Harmony as it was modified and edited under his direction." —*Diatessaron*, page 25. We have not the means of verifying this.

Immediately after the Sermon on the Mount Victor's Harmony has Matt. ix, 36, followed by Christ's sending forth the twelve apostles to preach and heal diseases, as found in Matt. x, Mark vi, 7-11, Luke ix, 2-6, with which is interwoven various matter taken from the second and third gospels, extending to Luke xiv, 26, 27, and Mark vi, 12, 13. This is followed by the marriage in Cana of Galilee (John ii, 1-11), and then the account of Christ's descending from the mount (Matt. viii, 1-4). A most absurd arrangement! But in Ciasca's *Diatessaron* the marriage in Cana (John ii, 1-11) follows closely John i, 35-51, the single sentence, "And Jesus returned in the power of the Spirit into Galilee" (Luke iv, 14*), intervening.

The section containing the account of the woman taken in adultery (John vii, 53-viii, 11) is placed immediately after John iii, 1-21, in Victor. This section, as we have already stated, is wanting in all the ancient Syriac versions, nor is it found in Tatian's *Diatessaron*. There is not in this Harmony of Victor the slightest trace of a Syriac origin. It seems to us probable that this Harmony owes its origin to some one who, having found a copy of Tatian's work, conceived the idea of making the arrangement of its matter very largely the basis of a Harmony of his own, and who was too conscientious to put either the name of Tatian or his own to the revision.

Eusebius, in his letter to Carpianus, speaks of another Harmony of the Gospels. "Ammonius of Alexandria," says he, "by means of great labor and pains, as it seems to me, has left us the Gospel by means of Four, by placing by the side of Matthew the corresponding passages of the remaining evangelists, so that the necessary result was that the consecutive order of the (other) three was destroyed, so far as it pertained to the texture of the reading."* It is very evident from this statement that Victor's Harmony could not have been based on that of Ammonius, since the Gospel of Matthew in Victor's Harmony is not always arranged in its regular order, is not entire, and is interwoven with matter from the other gospels.

* Vol. iv, page 1276, vol. xxii, of Migne's edition of the Fathers.

Henry M. Harman

ART. III.—GEORGE BANCROFT.

THE great historian of the United States, a statesman as well as a scholar, George Bancroft, has been for more than half a century one of the noted citizens of America, honored abroad as well as at home. He was the recipient of every mark of distinction which great institutions of learning and powerful governments could bestow. A man of strong individuality, rare gifts, great industry and patience, he has to a remarkable degree realized in old age the ideal dream of his youth. Graduating from Harvard at seventeen; taking his degree of doctor of philosophy at Göttingen at the age of twenty; pupil and friend of the most celebrated historians and philosophers of Germany; associating with famous statesmen and men of letters as he traveled from country to country in Europe—he returned to his native land with the best possible equipment for the work already planned, to which he gave the remainder of his long life. As secretary of the navy, acting secretary of war, American minister to Great Britain, minister to Prussia, and, later, to the new empire of Germany, he served his country well; but the chief value to the world of those years in political life lies in the results of the access which his position gave him to historical archives, especially those of America, Great Britain, and France. The historian, in him, always dominated the statesman; and the best years of his earlier manhood, with all of his later life, were given to uninterrupted labor upon the great historical work upon which his future fame will chiefly rest.

George Bancroft was born in 1800. The first volume of his *History of the United States* appeared in 1834, and exactly fifty years thereafter, in 1884, the author issued the final volume, bringing the history of the United States down to A. D. 1789—the beginning of the constitutional period. Never lagging, never hastening, only occasionally turning aside to engage in controversy with his critics, with a true scholar's enthusiasm and a true historian's fidelity, he has been a man of one work, the pride of his countrymen and the admiration of the learned world. With a patience and calmness unsurpassed he prosecuted his beloved labor into a period of life

when other men had long laid aside their tools to enjoy a few years of well-earned rest before they go hence. One by one the associates of his earlier days had disappeared, but he still kept vigorous step with the advancing years of the century, a man of to-day as well as yesterday, a fresh and vigorous thinker almost to the very last. In 1882 Mr. Bancroft said to the writer at the close of a brief interview :

Yes, yes; I am, indeed, an old man. So far as I am informed not one person whom I knew when I was twenty is now alive. All my early literary contemporaries are gone. I live largely in the past, but am still trying to do my duty by the present.

When his first volume was issued the names of Emerson, Longfellow, Prescott, Hawthorne, Motley, Lowell, Holmes, and Hildreth were unknown to fame; these all arose, flourished, and departed—save two—while Bancroft still remained, a hopeful, happy, working, grand old man, the center of Washington literary society and the valued adviser of younger men actively engaged in affairs of state.

When Bancroft first took up his pen the philosophical method of writing was in its infancy. This method he adopted, and it led him to recognize in our history the presence of factors and forces other than and above the human. In short, he recognized God in history. This placed him at once in fitness to be a leader of thought and a man of safe conclusions, head and shoulders above many of his able critics. He gave his readers more than a mere narrative of events, and carefully formed opinions of prominent characters. His aim was to give a clear representation of the colonies as they were at the start; the influences and purposes which determined their actions; to trace the processes by which they were developed and the principles which controlled that development, especially why they took the course they finally adopted, and thereby not only changed their own destiny, but indirectly wrought a radical change in the political affairs of all nations. In the most clear and happy manner Bancroft shows us how, like the leaven in the meal, certain vital principles, which had their origin in Christian brotherhood, equality, and justice, were cherished and matured by the men of New England, spread in their influence through all the colonies, and were the making of the nation at last, giving it life and inspiration.

Bancroft had many of the more valuable qualities of a great historian. To begin with, he had the intellectual temperament. He was born with the aptitudes of a scholar, and searched for knowledge with tireless avidity in every possible direction. He was one of our most accomplished linguists, and he ransacked all literature in all languages for his materials and comparisons, especially in tracing principles and verifying their development. "Widely versed in literature, he marked in it the tendency and spirit of historic movements before they appeared in the grosser forms of events;" and this untiring zeal of study kept even pace with the progress of the work to which he devoted himself. In addition to these happy qualities Bancroft presented a higher fitness for his task, and urged a higher claim upon our confidence, in his faith that "through the ages one increasing purpose runs," and human progress is ever measured by the development of liberty. Spiritual law was, with him, an inevitable and acknowledged force in the affairs of men and nations; and he held it as a part of a true historian's task to trace the operations of that force in its relations to facts. This lifted him above the grade of a mere annalist, and gave him rank with Hume and Grote and Hildreth and Motley, all of whom read events by their convictions, and argued and applauded as they wrote. It was therefore to be expected that his work would arouse opposition on the part of some, as "written upon a theory," and in a certain sense controversial. Many wise and just men also claim that the generalization which will establish the law of historical development is not yet possible, and that we are still observing phenomena. But our historian kept steadily on his way, in accordance with his convictions. In full sympathy with the great movement of his race and time, his conscientious studies enabled him to discern the impulse in which he believed and delighted, and with a graceful pen he pointed out and made conspicuous the men and deeds which indicated his faith. Bancroft's "History" traces the development of popular government upon this continent, in its most complete form, and under peculiarly favorable conditions. The historian believed, with all his soul, in the final success of the principle, because he had faith in the people and faith in Providence; and the events of the past third of a century have fully confirmed the wisdom of his opinion and fully justified the hope expressed in his first volume,

published a generation before the war of the rebellion. This attitude of the historian's mind led him to describe the people of the United States as well as to write of Congressional acts and the official aspects of his subject. He has not indulged in biography or memoirs to any great extent, but scattered through his pages are details of manners and accounts of movements, sayings, and doings of individuals and of commonwealths which give as vivid an impression of the actual daily life of the people as is consistent with his plan, or, in fact, necessary to a comprehension of the democratic idea which grew with their growth and strengthened with their strength. The force-element in the inherited Saxon character has not been overlooked in the narrative; and we are shown very clearly how it has been made effective for the best results through the influence of a fertile country isolated from the custom-and-precedent-burdened nationalities of the Old World, and other conditions favorable to governmental and individual freedom.

Bancroft's peculiar literary characteristics are rapid and condensed narration, skillful generalization, brilliant pictures, just and apt reflections, and the sharp, clear, comprehensive manner in which he summarizes and delineates character. While he never attempts the brilliant rhetorical effects which render the pages of Macaulay and Prescott and Motley so attractive, still he is never dull, and indeed his chapters have all the charm of perfect clearness, both in thought and expression, and possess the power to leave exact and lasting impressions upon the reader's mind. His knowledge is marvelous, his thoroughness and carefulness in workmanship are unfailing, his argument is logical, his evidence is well sifted and most effectively concentrated at the right point, while his gravity and dignity are always worthy the subject and the man. In all these particulars Bancroft easily takes rank with the best masters in English composition. Thoroughly American, and yet cosmopolitan as a thinker and writer, he has accomplished a work which none but an American could have so successfully projected and carried to its consummation. Whatever conclusions the world may reach in the future as to the wisdom of his method or the particular rank his *History* must finally hold in our literature, one thing is certain, his complete accounts of definite periods as viewed by one mind after the most profound study, and his luminous descriptions of

great characters, will forever stand among the best that human genius has produced. Whatever may be said of his philosophy, his literary mastership will never be questioned.

During Bancroft's official career his opportunities, both at home and abroad, for gathering and studying original documents bearing immediately or remotely on the history of the American colonies and republic were far greater than any American had hitherto enjoyed, and of them he made the best possible use. No writer has ever been more diligent in such wearisome pursuits. He was also especially favored by many of the noble and political families whose ancestors had been identified in one way or another with our contest for liberty and the formation of our constitutional government, and permitted to examine their private collections of records and documents, and to copy such as were pertinent to his purpose. The priceless collection of manuscripts thus obtained, copied in a large and legible handwriting and handsomely bound in about two hundred folio and quarto volumes, have for many years adorned the shelves of his great library as the most valuable of his possessions. Bancroft's idea of the proper use of original documents, an idea persistently carried out in his *History*, has won for him the gratitude of every discerning and appreciative reader. He has not, like too many modern historians, spread before us an undigested mass of letters, reports, and contemporary statements, valuable or worthless, true or false, as the case may be, and left us to write our own history after weighing and appraising the testimony as best we can. He is not afraid to trust his own judgment in all necessary decisions, well knowing that his familiarity with the entire subject, and his superior advantages for comprehensive and discriminating observation, justly entitle him to speak with authority. He manfully takes the responsibility of sifting all statements and offering the facts to the reader in concise form. Authorities he has for his abundant justification at every point; but these he holds in reserve for controversial purposes and for the settlement of any objections that may arise. A little careful investigation satisfies us that our author can be trusted; that his mistakes are usually in his theories, and seldom in either suppressing, overlooking, or misjudging facts. We are thankful that, in the best sense, he is a thinker and writer, and not a mere compiler of other men's

opinions and estimates. Therefore, when we cannot agree with him we respect him none the less; and, on the whole, gladly accept him as a manly leader and most stimulating companion in scholarly investigation.

Promptly after the appearance of the first three volumes of Bancroft's History came the indorsement of the author's distinguished friend and *quondam* teacher, Professor Heeren, of the University of Göttingen; an indorsement which was regarded as a royal decree in the realm of historical literature, and at once brought our modest American to the favorable notice of the *savants* of Europe. Professor Heeren said:

We know few modern historic works in which the author has reached so high an elevation at once as an historical inquirer and an historical writer. The great conscientiousness with which he refers to his authorities and his careful criticism give the most decisive proofs of his comprehensive studies. He has founded his narrative upon contemporary documents, yet without neglecting works of later times and other countries. His narrative is everywhere worthy of the subject.

This is high praise from the highest possible source; but Bancroft's countrymen were not a whit behind the Germans in learned and generous appreciation, for almost simultaneously with the above the distinguished scholar and orator, Edward Everett, wrote in the *North American Review* as follows:

A History of the United States by an American writer possesses a claim upon our attention of the strongest character. It would do so under any circumstances; but when we add that the work of Mr. Bancroft is one of the ablest of the class which has for years appeared in the English language—that it compares advantageously with the standard British historians—that as far as it goes it does such justice to its noble subject as to supersede the necessity of any future work of the same kind, and, if completed as commenced, will unquestionably forever be regarded both as an American and an English classic—our readers would justly think us unpardonable if we failed to offer our humble tribute to its merit.

When the third and last volume, relating to the colonization period, appeared, Prescott's highly cultivated literary taste was so gratified, and his generous heart so thoroughly warmed, that he sent a careful and most favorable criticism of the work to the *North American Review*. These favorable opinions were echoed by all literary circles in both hemispheres, and now,

after half a century has passed, they may, with slight modifications, be taken as a fair expression of the mature sentiments of the learned world. At once a philosopher, a poet, and a statesman, Bancroft has reared a monument of genius and industry which will stand forever. There are times, perhaps, when as an historian he may be fairly charged with short-sightedness and partiality; but in these occasional failings he has good company, and only proves himself to be human. Often too national in his tone and temper, he still certainly gains thereby in earnestness and eloquence. As the years go by, and our increasing army of scholars brings in its contributions to historical knowledge, and new facts and new documents are brought to light, Bancroft may possibly be superseded as the most complete authority; but that is hardly probable touching the period covered by his pages; while for picturesqueness, clearness, force, conciseness, exhaustive research, sound judgment, skillful array of facts, and grandeur of movement there is little prospect of his ever being surpassed. His works have been eagerly read from the first; new editions are constantly being brought out at home, to say nothing of the numerous reprints and translations in foreign lands. If universal popularity and immense sales are any proof of excellence, then Bancroft has no superiors. In 1884 he completed his thorough revision of the entire work, and so brought the great undertaking to a triumphant close, having carried out in full the plan of his early manhood, and linked his name with the history of his beloved country in imperishable luster. Continuing his life-habit of daily work, after 1884 he wrote several valuable papers for leading periodicals, and in June, 1889, he finished a life of Martin Van Buren, and as late as May, 1890, continued to labor on a life of President Polk, which he hoped to complete before finally laying down his pen. In his determination to work to the end he was an example to all writers.

As one of the founders of the American Historical Association, and its second president, Mr. Bancroft kept up his interest in and connection with the active progress of the particular department of scholarship to which he had devoted his life. Professor Herbert B. Adams, the secretary of Johns Hopkins University, in his report of the third annual meeting of the association in 1886, says:

Beyond all question the most notable individual feature of the Washington meeting was its presiding genius, George Bancroft. Chosen at Saratoga to be the president, he attracted the members to Washington, which has long been his favorite residence and historical workshop. Dwelling within easy reach of our national archives, he has drawn American history from its fountain-head. More than any other American, George Bancroft is the personal embodiment of the historic spirit of the United States. It was, therefore, highly appropriate that the newly formed Historical Association should make a pilgrimage to the abode of this venerable scholar, there to seek and obtain his patriarchal blessing.

Mr. Bancroft's address of welcome, found in the proceedings of the association for 1886, was characteristic and remarkably energetic and glowing for a man nearly ninety years of age, and made a profound impression upon all who were so fortunate as to hear it. The aged German historian, Dr. Leopold von Ranke, in a brief letter to the association, said:

It fills me with especial joy to see Mr. George Bancroft, one of the masters in our science, extending his hand to me from afar—a man who during his residence in Berlin bound me to himself with ties of reverential friendship.

When the *Life of Martin Van Buren* appeared, one of our journals referred to it in the following facetious words:

Surely Mr. George Bancroft is the Hotspur of historians, who kills him some six or seven dozen of Scots before breakfast, washes his hands and cries out, "Fie upon this quiet life; I want work!" Not content with the revision of his *United States*, with his rose-garden, and with those daily cares that most octogenarians find sufficient occupation, he drops into biography, and offers us a brief and interesting monograph on Martin Van Buren. It is an able book about an able man, and Bancroft, at eighty-nine years of age, has laid another debt of gratitude upon the public.

Literary honors were fairly heaped upon Mr. Bancroft by the most noted and powerful literary institutions of the world. Oxford, Bonn, Berlin, and many other universities conferred upon him the degree of D.C.L., while almost innumerable learned societies, at home and abroad, elected him to honorary membership. But, as he frequently declared, he prized most the love and approval of his own countrymen. As one reason for his unusually long working-life it may be said that Mr. Bancroft was very careful and regular in his daily habits, as are nearly all successful brain-workers. According to his per-

sonal testimony, given in a private conversation when he was past eighty years, nearly all his life it was his custom to rise at 5 o'clock in the summer and at 6 o'clock in the winter, from which time until 1 P. M. he was occupied in close literary work. At 1:30 the midday luncheon was served, and later in the afternoon he took the extended out-door exercise which was a sufficient explanation for such remarkable physical and intellectual vigor in one so old. Sometimes he walked long distances, but his favorite and most valued exercise was taken on horseback. Dinner came at 6 P. M., and the evening until 10 o'clock was devoted to social enjoyments, either in the homes of his friends or more frequently at his own residence. To what is called society in fashionable or political life he, however, declared he paid little or no attention. At 10 P. M. he retired. Mr. Bancroft's summer-home was at Newport, R. I., in a roomy old house embowered in trees and shrubbery. There is from the grounds a fine view of the ocean, and of course the air is particularly favorable to comfort and health. Here he had room and leisure enough to gratify fully his taste for flowers, and his roses were the pride of the town. At Newport his daily work still went on, and so late as last July callers were heartily received by him in the after part of the day, and his familiar form was seen in his easy-carriage upon the beach-drive and elsewhere taking the out-door exercise of which he was so fond. In October he returned to Washington.

At last our historian has passed away, full of years and full of honors, leaving behind a precious memory of his gentleness and goodness as well as his greatness. He was a man of simple Christian faith and remarkable correctness of life, and it is with thankfulness that we quote from a letter written by him to a dear friend, and dated May 30, 1882:

I was trained to look upon life as a season for labor. Being more than fourscore years old, I know that the time of my release will soon come. Conscious of being near the shore of eternity, I await, without impatience and without dread, the beckoning of the hand which will summon me to rest.

Ross C. Houghton

ART. IV.—NATURAL SELECTION AND CHRISTIANITY.

THE study and thought of the last thirty years have established beyond controversy the fact that the animal kingdom is universally subject to the law of natural selection. More animals are produced than can possibly find sustenance, and many must die that the few may live. A constant struggle is going on in nature, and those animals best adapted to their conditions will be the ones to survive and transmit their superior characteristics to subsequent generations. This is natural selection. This same law governed man in his early history, and in almost the same way as it governs the brute kingdom.

From the time that the tribal relation is established among men the struggle for existence ceases to be one of individuals and becomes one of tribes. It little profits an individual to be strong if he belongs to a weak tribe; it little profits a tribe to be composed of strong individuals if they fail to work in harmony with each other. Natural selection will still preserve the strongest, but it will be the strongest tribe. It is mutual trust, fidelity, honesty, concert in action, patriotism, disregard of death, that form the sinews of the nation, personal strength becoming a subordinate factor. A strong tribe may be composed of weak citizens and a weak tribe of strong citizens. Hence, it will be hereafter the mental qualities leading to union which will be preserved, while physical force will become secondary.

We must not imagine, however, that this tribal relation and the development of tribal qualities of tribal strength are peculiar to man. Among animals it is not unknown. Wolves hunt in companies, and together fearlessly attack animals which would easily master them separately. Insects live in communities, and, though individually they are weak, by concert of action they make themselves formidable to the strongest of animals.

But the central feature of the teaching of Christ was the law of love. It constantly appears in his words—now clothed in one parable, now in another. The new command given to man was to love his enemy, to do good to them that hated him, to help the weak, to pardon the erring, to resist not evil, and to give to him that asked. Henceforth it was to be the peacemaker who should be blessed, and he who wished to be greatest

was to be servant of all. Now, all of these thoughts produce laws of action diametrically opposed to those which have given rise to the development of animals. The law of nature tells each to put himself first, without regard to others. The law of Christ tells us to be as mindful of our neighbor's good as of our own. It has been called altruism, or love for others, in distinction from egoism, or love for self. It has been called humanity, or the law of man, in distinction from brutality, which is the law of animals. It has shown that the basis of wrong-doing is temporary gratification of self, and since selfishness is the universal law of brute creation Christ has taught that the life which is normal for the brute is that which is wrong for mankind. Self-preservation is the first law of nature, but not the first law for man. This law of Christ, with its application, was a revelation. It can never change. It will always be binding upon man to love his neighbor as himself, and this law will be the foundation of all morality for all ages.

No one can question that to-day Christianity more fully appreciates this law than ever before, and that the life of a Christian nation is nearer the Christian ideal than at any past time. But how far short of the true ideal are we still! Selfishness is still the moving principle of most men, and even in our thoughts we fail to accept the law of love as it is taught. Nominally we accept the Golden Rule, and then interpret its application to suit our own ideas of expediency. Christ taught us to love our enemies, but we regard it as perfectly justifiable to do them any amount of injury in war. Christ said, "If any one smite thee on the one cheek, turn to him the other also;" and we never interpret this as it was taught, but only see in it a figurative command to meekness. Christ said, "Resist not evil;" and this we regard in our innermost thoughts as an impossibility, for it would prove the death-blow of society to obey it. In the same way it would be possible to consider the majority of Christ's commands, and to find that we put interpretations upon them which suit our beliefs and circumstances, though not in accord with the teachings of the Master. Now, we do not intend to imply that all of Christ's commands should be taken literally and fulfilled to the letter, at least at the present time; but before we rest complacent in the belief that we fulfill them as they should be fulfilled, let us ask if our

society and governments are so near perfection as to require preservation at the expense of all else, and let us remember that Christ himself obeyed his own precepts literally.

Yet the law of love is a law which we are enjoined to obey at all times to the fullest extent of possibility, and perhaps the time may come when it can be followed literally as it came from the lips of its Author. Imagine a condition of mankind where all people are truly actuated by the principle contained in the Golden Rule. Would it not, under such circumstances, be the most expedient course to obey all of Christ's commands literally? The law of Christ is an ideal toward which man is to rise. Christ came to found a universal kingdom whose uniting bond should be love. This has not yet been accomplished. Instead of a universal kingdom there has as yet resulted only the Church, which contains but a few of mankind, and which has subdivided itself into sects. It is plainly a makeshift. Still, in this seeming failure of Christ's mission there is the sure promise of success, for the one common feature of this broken, scattered Church is the law of love, and this love is broadening constantly in its scope. Through the means of the law thus preserved to us by the Church there will arise a kingdom which shall be the kingdom Christ came to establish. Perhaps it will come through the Church, perhaps through government, perhaps through reformation; but when it does come it will be recognized as that for which Christ was born, lived, and died. Christ's Church thus serves a noble purpose, though it may not be the end sought.

The full force of this new law promulgated by Christ can only be appreciated when we remember that it is a law differing from that which has produced the development of the animal kingdom. In the animal kingdom every individual strives for his own pleasure regardless of all others, and this, through the law of natural selection, results in the constant advance of the race in strength and perfection. The biologist, therefore, cannot fail to ask whether a law which has proved so valuable for animals would not also be best for the development of man. Has man reached such a stage of perfection that he no longer needs the beneficial results of the law of natural selection? Is it possible that the law of love for others is the best law for man, while love for self has been the best for the rest of nature? Let us,

then, as scientists, ask for some of the results which the law of love has already produced.

We may first notice in passing some of the evident beneficial results which are every-where recognized as due to the influence of this doctrine of altruism. Prominent among these results we find the raising of the condition of woman. Among Christian nations she is recognized as the equal of man, while among heathen nations her position is an inferior one. The doctrine of love founded all our institutions of charity—homes for the care of the weak, of the blind, of the inebriates, the insane. No charitable institutions are known except among Christian nations. This doctrine has ameliorated the condition of the criminal. It has established societies for help of the discharged criminal which try to give him a new start in honest life. It has founded the Church, which, with all the evils resulting from human weakness, has always been the strongest force for good that the world has ever seen, and always will be so long as its ideals are higher than its practices. The law of love has largely done away with the pleasure of personal conflict; the gladiatorial combat and tournament, which have been in times past recognized as sources of amusement, have gone. The duel, which even until now has been deemed a legitimate method of righting wrong, is passing away, and the prize-fight has been condemned by the enactment of law. But while the law of love has thus created a strong tide against personal conflict it has as yet had little influence upon national conflicts. We sometimes dream of a time when wars shall cease; and the very fact that we dream of such a time shows that the race has advanced not a little in the line of Christ's teachings, for with the ancients war was a delight.

We must not, however, fail to recognize that the spirit which actuated the personal conflict of olden times has by no means disappeared. The love for conquest is as strong as ever. Man certainly seems to be adapting himself to the new law of nature, but his progress thus far has been scarcely more than a turn in the direction of peace. We have partly outgrown our love for personal combat, but the desire for personal conquest and personal victory is as strong as ever.

Now if peace, happiness, and equality are ideals to be desired, then the law of love is beneficial to the human race so far as

above considered. But, on the other hand, it cannot be overlooked that this same law of love has a tendency to undo much of the benefit that the human race has derived as the result of the law of natural selection. When a rigid selection determined that the strong should live and the weak should perish or become slaves, the physical power of the race increased and man improved as an animal. But what has been the result of the slow modification of this law into the law of altruism? The physically strong man has now very little advantage over the weak, at least so far as the production of offspring is concerned; and this is the final basis upon which the law of selection must act. Our institutions of charity are not unmixed blessings. They encourage dependence and idleness. They are based upon the feeling that the unfortunate man should not be allowed to suffer for his misfortunes, and that the fortunate should share with him. Such institutions have a tendency to fasten weakness on the race; for the weakest and least thrifty classes, instead of being crowded out of existence by their inability to cope with the conditions of life, are encouraged to live, and this will always mean opportunity to transmit their weakness to future generations, since poverty and indolence almost always go hand in hand with large families. Our humane treatment of criminals also has its evil side. Draco said that every crime was worthy of death, and only the upright have a right to live. This is the law of nature. Human statutory law has always proceeded partly upon this basis, and until recently death has been the penalty for most crimes. We have reduced the death penalty to one crime, and are thinking of abolishing it altogether. There is no doubt that it is the growing feeling of love, sympathy, and humanity that has produced this leniency in the treatment of criminals. But facts have sadly shown that the children of criminals are almost always criminal; and our humane treatment of the class holds out to them a probability of living and transmitting their vices to subsequent generations. To-day many thinkers are becoming alarmed at this threatening result of our application of the law to forgive those that trespass against us.

In the family, too, it is the weak child who receives the most love. He is the one who is the most carefully guarded and assisted in life, while his stronger brothers have more of the

battle of life to fight for themselves. In this way it frequently happens that the weak child may marry first and have at least an equal chance with his brother in leaving offspring. For the physical good of man as a race there certainly ought to be a premium placed upon strength. The disappearance of the Olympic games and the tournament, and the battle of minds that has come instead, have taken away the premium upon manly vigor that was formerly so prominent and so healthful.

So in a hundred ways the law bidding us love our neighbors as ourselves, to resist not evil, and to cherish the feeble, has a tendency to place a premium upon weakness and to increase the chance of the least fit individuals to live and produce progeny. In all of these instances we see one constant underlying thought, namely, all individuals must have as nearly equal chances as possible. It is this feeling for the rights and happiness of the individual which inspires all of the institutions of mercy noticed above. This feeling leads us to forget the good of the race, which is more intangible, and thus leads to the evils which we have named.

Still, the study of civilized society to-day shows these evils, which certainly have arisen from the attempt of man to follow the teaching of Christ. Will it not follow that the race is degenerating? Long-continued study of nature has shown the scientist that just as soon as natural selection ceases to act in developing a race of superior animals the race begins to degenerate. Will not the same be true for man? With all the facts of nature and humanity in our minds can we believe that the law which lifts the weak, and thus relatively pulls down the strong, is really the best for the human race?

In answer to this somewhat serious question we must first notice that the law of natural selection is still a factor in human development. We have spoken of the law of altruism as reversing the action of the law of natural selection, and it certainly does do this in its immediate action. But this statement is perhaps partly misleading. The law that those best fitted to their conditions will be, in the long run, the ones to survive the struggle for existence is a law of so clearly a self-evident nature that nothing can controvert it. It must be true of mankind under all conditions. But the new law given him to live by completely reverses its immediate action.

Among animals the basis of the law of natural selection is the selfish interest of the individual, and except in the rarest instances the individual does not sacrifice himself for the good of another. Among men, however, the individual universally sacrifices himself, to some extent, to the good of the family or the tribe, and natural selection thus acts upon the family or tribe rather than upon the individual. But it never for a moment withdraws its influence as a conservative factor. Physical weakness is sure to result eventually in the weakening of the reproductive system; and as soon as this occurs, the force of natural selection is as great as ever, serving as a check to prevent too great degeneration. In other words, the law of the animal world is still in force on the human race. It acts, however, upon the family and not upon the individual.

The first great truth that we thus reach is that with the establishment of the law of love the physical development of the race ends, or at least is temporarily checked. All study of nature teaches that to produce physical development some sort of selection must have firm hold of the reproductive system or habits, in order that the weak may be prevented from transmitting their weakness and that the strong may increase in numbers. But it is certain that no such law of selection has hold upon the human race. That custom of society which cherishes the weak instead of crushing them cannot fail to put an end to the physical development of the race.

But this conclusion is not a disappointing one. Man is far superior to all other animals, not because of his physical, but because of his intellectual powers. His development must be intellectual, and not physical. With the development of his intellectual and moral nature he would remain just as far superior to all animals, and be perfectly able to hold his own in the struggle for existence, even though he should fall far short of the physical standard of Richard Cœur de Lion. For primitive man, provided with only rude weapons, physical power was necessary, since he had to contend with powerful animals. For early historic man, too, we can believe that personal conflict and wars were necessary. Without them the stimulus which developed intellect would have been wanting. But after his intelligence had reached the high grade found at the time of Christ no *such* stimulus was needed. Man's physical development was

practically ended, and his intellect had reached a stage where it needed a stimulus of a different sort. Christ, therefore, proclaimed clearly that a new era in the development of the human race had come—an era which had been slowly but surely approaching from the advent of man. The recognition, then, of the fact that man's physical development has ceased is no disappointing conclusion, but a glorious truth. The history of animals has shown that during all the past ages animals have been rising in the efficiency of their physical powers. Even the most extreme evolutionists teach that with the appearance of a man an entirely new line of progression began. From this time the development of mind became the aim of nature. In the development of man, therefore, the physical nature has been neglected, and the announcement of the law of Christ gave a final emphasis to his solitary position in nature.

The key to the solution of the problem that we are studying lies in the fact that the development of man's mental and moral nature could never have progressed to their higher grades if the principle of natural selection, acting through self-gratification, were still the law of life. Natural selection tends to individualization and isolation, while the law of love tends to produce union. It is the law of selfishness which preserves the tribal relations existing among savages. It is a short-sighted selfishness, to be sure, for the continued separation of the tribes has proved their destruction. It is this same law, in large measure, that has united men together into nations for mutual protection. But, plainly enough, the feeling of love and sympathy must be an important factor in the national relation, or the union would rapidly drop into pieces. A little thought will show that the greater the extent to which the law of love becomes the guiding principle of human action, so much the greater will become the human nations, and so much the more will men tend to unite into a common brotherhood. Now, it is certain that the greater the amount of unity among men the higher will be their mental and moral development. The very complexity of the various grades of society produces the progress in man's mental nature, for with the increase in the complexity of the various relations there must be an increase in the mental power to meet the relations.

As above used, the term mental power is intended to include

both the intellectual and moral sides of human character. It immediately occurs to ask if the moral condition of the city is superior to that of the small community. The reverse seems to be true, for the city is certainly the place where the lowest condition of man is found. But we must remember that the moral nature, in order to reach its highest development, must be something more than a negative quality. A person who has not committed a wrong simply because he has not been tempted is purely negative, so far as his moral nature is concerned. Indeed, he has no moral nature. In the same way, a hermit can never become a person of positive strength of character, for he has no relations to other men, which relations alone make a positive character a possibility. The morality of the small community is largely of the negative character. It is true that in the city some do fall very low, but it is none the less true that under these complex conditions there is the greatest possibility of development of strength of the moral nature. It is, perhaps, easier to live pure in the small communities, but for this reason less positive strength of character is developed.

So, too, of the intellectual nature. It is certainly true that the country produces most of the original geniuses and men of note. But these men never have the opportunity to show their mental power unless their relations to mankind become broadened beyond those of the country village. While the country life may develop the man, it is the broad contact with humanity which brings the intellectual powers into activity. Taking the intellectual and moral nature together, therefore, it is certain that the association into large communities will inevitably give the conditions for the highest mental development. Every-where in the world we find that the smaller the community the more narrow and peculiar are the mental traits of its members; while the larger the community the more is the individual molded into a rounded form. Isolation may perhaps serve to elevate the individual and produce the genius; but it is the association of individuals into large communities that makes it possible for the genius to be any thing more than a mighty fighter. Mighty warriors form the only class of geniuses that savagery can produce.

Now, just as the mental nature of man advances when the family relation is superseded by that of the village—just as the

mental power of man increases when the tribal relation becomes national—so will the mental development of man take immeasurably greater strides when the division of the children of men into nations shall give place to a universal brotherhood of love. Even in our nations to-day, large as they are, we find the mental traits somewhat narrowed. The German mind, the English mind, and the American mind are three different entities. If the three minds could be fused into one, and then divided by three, the resulting mind would be an improvement over any one of them. If these three nations could be united into one, so that the resulting race should show some of the methodical care of the German, the keenness of generalization of the Englishman, and the push and activity of the American, would not the resulting race be on a higher plane than either of them can reach individually? The law of natural selection, acting alone, results in the production of many individuals or tribes at enmity with each other. The law of love, when perfect, will unite man into one nation of love. The former will always result in narrow, one-sided mental powers, carried to different extremes according to circumstances. The law of love will produce a race whose mental power is the resultant of the intellectual and moral force of all, and for this reason will be, in the long run, not only broader but will rise to a higher level.

As we have seen, the law of natural selection is still in force, the law of love only serving to make the conditions more complex and making physical strength no longer a potent factor. With natural selection thus preventing too great physical degradation, and with the law of love tending to produce mental development, the human race will rise to its highest possibilities. Physical strength and mental development do not go hand in hand; and it is almost universally the case that the lower classes increase the most rapidly. The so-called higher classes have fewer children than the lower—a fact more or less counterbalanced by their superior knowledge in rearing their families. Now, more rapid reproduction is the character that must be seized upon by natural selection. The higher classes are constantly being re-enforced from the lower. To preserve the aristocracy of England it has been constantly replenished from the lower ranks; and in our own country we are continually finding that men are coming from the lower classes into the higher,

and those belonging to the upper families are becoming less and less numerous and less influential in real life. In short, the law of natural selection, acting in the modified form in connection with the law of love, instead of crushing the lower classes is constantly raising them to a higher level, and is at the same time checking the abnormal development of the upper classes. If the two act in harmony they will tend to keep mankind near a uniform level, and thus to raise the human race as a whole. The result will be a development broader and more certain than would be possible if individual families or tribes were to continue to advance unchecked by this leveling tendency. The more completely man adopts this law of love as a principle of action the greater will be the tendency toward the abolishment of castes in society. As the union of men becomes closer, the better able will all be to share in the knowledge of the race, and to profit by the experience and discoveries of all mankind. Mental progress differs from physical progress in requiring union of men into large bodies to effect it. To develop a strong animal it is best to isolate the strong individual or family from the possibility of breeding with the weak. To develop the mighty mind the essential condition is union.

It has long been recognized that the laws under which the animal and vegetable kingdom live result in what is called divergence of plants and animals. The numerous offspring of an animal being under different conditions are kept more or less separate from each other by mutual hostility, and in various ways have a tendency to become associated into groups. In successive generations natural selection preserves those best fitted to special conditions; and the result is, that the descendants of any one animal gradually separate into several lines of descent, with characters more and more unlike each other. There are thus produced the thousands of species with the infinite variety that characterizes the organic world to-day. In the early history of mankind the same laws were in effect, and in like manner produced divergence. Whatever might have been the origin of man, there is no doubt that since his appearance there has been wide divergence of type. The various races of man have departed widely from the primitive central type. This divergence has, moreover, been produced in the same way as among animals, by the isolation of small groups

from others. But just as fast as the law of love finds its way into the laws regulating human relations, just so fast does the tendency toward disunion become replaced by a tendency to union, and divergence of character gives way to convergence of character. The greater the amount of love and confidence the greater become the tribes and nations. The increase in the size of the nations acts against the increase in their variety and number. As the nations grow larger the formation of new races is checked and finally ended. Even to-day, slight as is our advance in the direction of the law of universal love, the formation of new races has ceased. The nations are constantly growing larger, absorbing into themselves the smaller nations, which become lost in the great whole. Since, then, among mankind there is no longer a tendency to produce numerous species, the advance will be an advance of the whole race as a unit. The new law does not favor any clique, but produces the greatest good to the greatest number. Natural selection and the other laws of nature are the best for the development of animals and the body, but the addition of the law of love, which reverses the action of natural law, is the best for the development of mankind and mind.

To avoid misunderstanding, we must again notice that Christ taught for all time, and that his law of altruism was not intended for his own day nor for our day, but as an ideal. When we suggest that his teachings were perhaps intended to be applied literally, we would not assert that such can be our interpretation of them to-day. An isolated individual might adopt them, but it is doubtful whether such an instance would be of any value even as an example. As we have seen, the great value of the law of love is that it compels mankind to advance as a unit rather than as isolated individuals or families; and, until the bulk of mankind reaches a higher plane of love, it can amount to nothing for a single individual to become unique. For an individual to adopt the doctrine of non-resistance in a period of universal strife would be futile. To adapt the human race to a perfect law of love is not a matter of a generation or a score of centuries. As yet the race is in a state of transition from barbarism to humanity. It has not lost its love for victory and power at the expense of others, though it has begun to apply these feelings to the more innocent forms

of conquest; and the law of love is constantly becoming a more potent factor. In this transition period from selfishness to perfect love it will naturally follow that temporary evil will result. In our ignorance of the laws of life and heredity we try to adopt the teachings of Christ, and produce results which occasionally frighten us, but for which we do not see any remedy. But when the law of love is more fully established, and when mankind understand the laws of life and heredity, and with wisdom try to obey the law of love, then benevolence will become an unmixed blessing, wars will cease, and the rights and happiness of the individual will be achieved without sacrificing the lasting good of the race.

It is plain, then, that the advantages accruing to mankind from the law that unites him into a common brotherhood are far more than enough to counterbalance the evils which arise from the cessation of the immediate action of the principle of natural selection. Natural selection, if it should continue to be the law of life, would produce a race of vigorous physical men skilled in all sorts of war and strategy. It would make the highest aim of man that of the soldier or the successful general. It would continue an endless series of enmities, and would prevent the union of men for long periods. Such is the highest possibility for animals and savages. But the replacement of this law, or rather the adding to it of the new law of love, immediately proclaims, though we have hardly begun to realize it as yet, that henceforth man's physical nature may be left to itself, and that his further development must be physical.

The significance of the teaching of Christ, then, is found in the fact that he announced this law at a time when it was not in the slightest degree understood. His disciples failed to understand it; the Church founded in his name failed to understand it; nineteen centuries have rolled by, and still we fail to believe that the doctrine was meant literally as taught by Christ. So far have we failed to absorb its spirit that even to-day our highest honors are reserved for the successful general or the inventor of an especially deadly instrument of warfare. We still fail to believe that the law of love for others can be the guiding principle of life except in a very modified sense, and we therefore place our modified interpretation upon the teachings of Christ. The teachings of Christ were not the result of evolution; they

were a revolution of thought, of life, of development. But so little were they the result of the development of the times that no one understood them enough to recognize that the simple words of Christ contained in them any thing new.

A summary of the outline of the argument of the foregoing article may be briefly given as follows :

1. The great gift of Christ to the world was the law of universal love. This law, since it forbids man to put his own interest above that of his neighbor, antagonizes, at least in its immediate action, the law of natural selection.

2. The results of partial adoption of the new law have been partly beneficial and partly injurious. Benevolence, broader sympathy, disappearance of personal conflict, etc., are among the beneficial results. But many of the most serious evils threatening modern civilization arise from the constant tendency to assist the various low and weak classes to live and multiply, and thus to increase the progeny of weakness ; and this tendency is due to the feeling that no one ought to prosper at the expense of his neighbor—that is, the law of love.

3. This law of love is, however, the great force uniting man into large communities.

4. The union of men into communities is absolutely necessary for their higher mental development. Instead of producing abnormal development in narrow lines, the union of love tends to cause mankind to advance as a whole.

5. Therefore the law of love in distinction from the law of selfishness is the law which is best to produce mental and moral development, though it is not adapted to physical development.

6. Christ's advent was thus the proclamation that henceforth the development of mankind was to be in the direction of mind and not of body. The physical development of the animal kingdom had reached its limit, and the mental and moral development was to take its place.

7. The laws under which animals are developed produce divergence of character, while the law of universal love checks the production of new varieties and produces convergence of character.

H. W. Comr

ART. V.—A LESSON FROM THE OLD WORLD FOR
THE NEW.

FROM Maine to California the people of the United States are agitating the question of temperance reform. A large army of determined men and women have pledged themselves to each other, after the manner of the forty conspirators against the life of Paul, that they will give themselves and the country no rest till the evil is abolished. On the other hand, a not less determined body, including three hundred thousand persons interested in one way or another in the business, is equally resolved that what they call their personal liberty shall be maintained. Between the two, the otherwise placid surface of society is in no little commotion of a sort a sailor would have no hesitation in defining as a chop sea.

The advocates of temperance reform are, no doubt, in a majority if they could only come to an agreement as to the course to be pursued. Among the methods suggested are national and state prohibition, high license, moral suasion, popular education of the young as to the evils of strong drink, organization in the direction of temperance societies or a temperance party, and the elective franchise for women.

The advocates of each separate measure profess unbounded confidence in their solution of the vexed question, and maintain their particular view with the perseverance for which good people have always been noted in questions of conscience. Meanwhile the cause makes doubtful progress, and the lamentable fact confronts us that the yearly increase in the consumption of ardent spirits is altogether out of proportion to the increase of the population.

Would it not be worth while, at this point, to listen to the voice of history? If we can find an era like our own, where the same evil was even more fearfully prevalent, and where at last, after other measures had failed, something was found that greatly relieved the situation, would it not be the part of wisdom to inquire what that remedy was? If the example was furnished by our own English-speaking race it is all the better; and if we must look across the water to Great Britain in the middle of the eighteenth century for instruction, we will then

have hardly gone farther for a lesson than a Hebrew prophet went for a rotten girdle by which he might instruct the men of his times.

England in the eighteenth century is a most interesting study. The germs of the present order of things were there: the England and America of to-day were then in process of evolution. It was an era of great men and of great enterprises. What century can boast of men of greater genius than were Johnson, Goldsmith, Pitt, Fox, Wilberforce, Butler, Hogarth, and Addison, or of more important events than the issue of the first daily newspaper, the invention of the steam-engine and the spinning-jenny, or the reforms with which the names of John Howard and Robert Raikes stand connected? In spite of this splendid galaxy of shining names and brilliant deeds it was an era of moral corruption, coarseness, and want of faith.

This was true of the entire period covered by the reigns of the four Georges, but was more particularly applicable to the reign of George II., extending from 1727 to 1760. As to religion, a strong ebb tide of both faith and works had left the country about destitute of it. Practically, all that remained of it were a few forms of worship considered very appropriate for occasions of state and some events in private life. Religious interest centered in the offices of the Church, which furnished many good livings and required few services which could not be set aside without exciting comment. "In the higher circles," said Montesquieu, "every one laughs if one talks of religion." Voltaire, in his visit to England at this time, found the religious atmosphere entirely congenial to him. The Bible, in the popular estimation, occupied about the place which the single copy Hannah More was able to find in the parish of Cheddar did, where it was used as a prop to a flower-pot.

Immorality must necessarily be flagrant to attract the attention and secure the appointment of a committee of investigation from the House of Lords, and especially during an administration led by so flagrant an offender as Sir Robert Walpole.

The report of the committee called attention, among other things, to an organization of persons calling themselves "Blasters," who professed to be votaries of the devil, offered prayers to him, and drank his health. The public streets were infested with libertines and thieves, and after nightfall were not as safe

for an honest man or virtuous woman as now are the wilds of the West. In high life purity and fidelity to the marriage vow were sneered out of fashion. In low life secret marriages and clandestine amours were too commonplace to attract attention. The condition of the stage, which sometimes is an exponent of the morals of an age, reveals the awful depth of depravity of the times. In vain one turns the pages of Henry Fielding, the play-writer of the period, for one play, or even a page, that is not defiled. So ripe for judgment seemed the whole institution that we do not wonder that Bedford ascribes the memorable storm which swept over England in 1703 to the iniquities of the stage. The moral pollution which shows itself in the dramas of Fielding is brought out even more vividly in the pictures of Hogarth. In giving the world his "Five Scenes in the Life of a Harlot" and "Seven Scenes in the Life of a Rake" he was only putting on canvas what every body recognized as common occurrences. Among the slimy monsters that infested this Dismal Swamp none were so numerous or venomous as what have well been called the Serpents of the Still.

"Drinking," said Walpole, "is at the highest wine mark." He is worthy of credit, for the administration of which he was the head is known in history as "The Drunken Administration." "Your Dane, your German, and your swag-bellied Hollander," wrote a traveler, "are nothing to the English." There were one-bottle, two-bottle, and even five-bottle men; and these æsthetic drinkers esteemed it a great privilege if, at their carousals, they could get possession of a beauty's shoe in order to ladle out wine, while they drank to the health of the light-heeled mistress. In the lower drinking-houses customers paid according as they desired to become simply drunk or dead drunk.

"There is no safety," wrote Bishop Benson, "in town or country. Our people are cruel and inhuman. These accursed spirituous liquors which, to the shame of our government, are so easy to be had and are in such quantities drank, have changed the very nature of our people, and will, if continued to be drank, destroy the very race itself."

Benjamin Franklin, who spent some years in London about this time, tells in his autobiography how he found that all his companions in the printing-office where he worked drank five

pints of porter daily, and one even six, while he, who drank none, was regarded as a sort of *curio* from the wilds of America.

Multiply the number of saloons in an American city by ten, or perhaps twenty, until at least every sixth house is a drinking-place, and you have only reproduced the condition of London during the reign of George II. The lines of an eighteenth century poet indicate that the saloon of that day was worse than our own, being frequented by persons of all ages and both sexes :

" There enter the prude and the reprobate boy,
The mother of grief and the daughter of joy ;
The servant maid slim and the serving man stout :
They quickly steal in and they slowly reel out."

Strong drink in abundance was esteemed as necessary as the clergyman to seal the marriage vow or properly entomb the dead. At the burial of the wife of one Butler a tun of red port wine was used, besides the white. Since, according to the custom, only women were present, it must have been a large funeral, or else the scene of mourning ended in drunken orgies. The *Gentleman's Magazine* of that date has an item concerning a christening at Beddington, in Surrey, where the nurse was so drunk that after she had taken off the baptismal robe, instead of laying the child in the cradle she put it on a large open fire, which burned it to death in a few moments. The history of all nations and times may in vain be searched for an example of such appalling drunkenness as the cities and villages of England presented in the middle of the eighteenth century.

We now turn to the measures that were put in force to meet this alarming state ; for we may be certain that there were not wanting those who appreciated the situation and strove to provide a remedy. There were those who saw in a rigorous enforcement of the civil law a powerful check, if not a complete remedy, for the prevailing evil. The Society for the Reformation of Manners, previously formed, now entered upon a vigorous campaign for the punishment of evil-doers. In the year 1724 it prosecuted 2,723 cases for lewd, profane, drunken, and gambling practices. In thirty-three years the number of prosecutions had reached 89,393. This wholesale enforcement of law showed surprising vigor on the part of the members of this society, and constituted a fair test of the ability of the law to correct a popular evil. A single page of statistics illustrates

what was really accomplished. The consumption of British distilled spirits in the first half of the century was as follows: A. D. 1684, 527,000 gallons; 1714, 2,000,000 gallons; 1727, 3,601,000 gallons; 1735, 5,394,000 gallons. Such an increase in the use of distilled spirits, to say nothing of wine and beer, would have been worthy of note at any time, but to have occurred at the very time when the Society for the Reformation of Manners was putting forth such extraordinary efforts, makes it truly remarkable. The vigorous fusilade of law and justice filled the prisons to overflowing, but made no more impression on the prevailing vice than the cannonade which Napoleon directed against the famous Egyptian mud fort.

In 1736 Parliament undertook the case. It was high time, if, in the debate pending the passage of the bill, Lord Lonsdale spoke truly: "In every part of the great metropolis, whoever shall pass along the street will find wretchedness stretched upon the pavement, insensible and motionless, and only removed by the charity of passers from the danger of being crushed by carriages, or trampled by horses, or strangled by filth in the common sewers."

The bill, by which a tax of £1 per gallon was put on all spirituous liquors, and which also prohibited any person from selling them in quantities of less than two gallons without paying a tax of £50 a year, and to which even Walpole assented, finally passed the House of Lords. This was the highest kind of high license, and amounted to virtual prohibition. To many it seemed that the end of the struggle had finally been reached. The passage of the bill produced a most extraordinary commotion throughout the nation. In some places mobs paraded the streets with the banner "No gin, no king." At length quiet was restored, and an immediate though slight decrease in the frequency of drunkenness was observed. Soon a clandestine trade sprang up which the authorities could not—at least did not—control. Many took out a wine license, and, under cover of this, sold all kinds of drinks, in which, as usual, they had the help of the more venal officers of the law. At the end of two years the high license measure was a confessed failure and was repealed.

The pendulum now swung to the opposite extreme in a measure which reduced the tax on spirits as well as the license of the seller to a nominal sum. Whatever good was expected

of this latter measure was doomed, as the former, to disappointment. An attempt was then made to replace the use of stronger spirits by beer and light wines. Hogarth proclaimed his confidence in this movement by two pictures, called respectively "Beer Street" and "Gin Street." In "Beer Street" every body was big-bellied and happy. Men were playing with their children while the happy wives were standing by, and all was serene. In "Gin Street" they were quarreling and fighting. A drunken mother had neglected her child, which was falling down a flight of steps. Squalor and wretchedness reigned supreme. However much the consumption of beer was increased by this movement the increase in the use of stronger spirits went steadily on.

Much was expected from a bill which passed Parliament making debts for liquors irrecoverable by law, and another having a provision for an indemnity in case of damage. Still another measure sought to secure the closing of all saloons at midnight. There is but one modern measure for the suppression of intemperance that is not as old as the middle of the eighteenth century, and the single exception is the franchise for women.

One difficulty was that drunkenness was linked in with so many other vices. The tares were growing with the tares, and to pluck out one single variety seemed even more hopeless than to attempt to plow up the whole field. That a measure of reform failed in such an extreme case would not argue it worthless; but certainly, if any thing succeeded, it would greatly enhance its importance to have gained success under such circumstances. Success at length was partially obtained. At the very time when the situation was most hopeless a movement began of an entirely different character, and from the time of its appearance a change for the better was apparent. It began with three young men, who, reading their Bible, saw they could not be saved without holiness, followed after it, and incited others to do so. The spark of grace the warmth of which they soon felt in their hearts became as a flame of fire, and was manifestly a coal from off the altar of God. The movement was, in fact, a new discovery of God, the unseen world, human responsibility, and eternal destiny. It came through the new light shed upon the study of a long-known and once valued but of late partially neglected volume. The appearance of the book,

and at the same time of a light to illumine its pages, was to the age like the re-appearance of light in the binnacle of a storm-tossed ship which showed that the vessel was headed toward the rocks which could not be far away. Such seemed the situation to these young men, and, forgetting their youth, inexperience, and inability to cope with the moral lethargy and spiritual death of the times, they went forth to warn men to flee from the wrath to come.

At first their preaching was looked upon much as were the labors of Noah's carpenters, when they began to lay the keel of the ark. The very appearance of men who really believed in eternal and unseen verities—who had keenest convictions concerning duty and truth—who even trampled on their pride, advocated fasting, plainness of dress, and self-denial—who even spoke confidently of enjoying the favor of God—for such men to be precipitated into such an age was like thrusting red-hot iron into water, with the inevitable result of a great commotion.

The leaders of the movement were John and Charles Wesley and George Whitefield, though there was not far behind them a host of young men fully as earnest if not as gifted. The closing of the churches against them was a providential dispensation which sent them to the docks, the commons, jails, and collieries. The people heard them gladly, though every word was an arraignment of their dissolute lives. In place of the formal responses of the Church of England the preacher had tears, groans, and cries for mercy. All Britain was moved. The clergy of the Established Church awoke and came out of their ecclesiastical graves to see what the commotion was about. Some returned to their slumber, some remained to oppose, and some to pray. Where a preacher had, as Whitefield on one occasion, fifty thousand persons within sound of his voice, the movement must be rapid. It was noticeable, as on another occasion, that the publicans and harlots, the thieves, drunkards, and libertines, were the most ready to hear and to enter the kingdom of heaven. It was a kindling at the bottom of society from whence the flames found their way at length through the entire structure to the top.

As the work spread there was a marked gain in the increased prevalence of temperance. This was only because there was a noticeable improvement in every direction. Some who had for-

merly gained a livelihood in the business found that the gains of the iniquitous traffic were becoming as unbearable as were the thirty pieces of silver to Judas. With greater wisdom than the apostate, instead of hanging themselves, they abandoned the trade. Multitudes exchanged the nightly carousal of the saloon for the class-meeting, and found their old passion for drink swallowed up in the new experience of the love of Jesus.

After Whitefield had labored for three months at Bristol among a rude people, some of whom had never been in a church, the members of the Society for the Reformation of Public Manners were astonished at the amazing changes that had been wrought by his preaching—changes which they had in vain endeavored to effect by force of law. Whitefield was no less successful at Kingswood, where, after a briefer stay, the colliers, instead of carousing and swearing, made the hills and woods ring with hymns of praise. The famous biographer of Johnson records that sometime in 1773 Johnson said:

I remember when all the people in Litchfield got drunk every night, and were not the less thought of. We are drinking less now than formerly.

The inference that those who still got drunk were less thought of than others marks an amazing change in public opinion, of more importance than the mere fact of drinking less than formerly. It was brought about by the revival of primitive Christianity, then in the fourth decade of its existence.

The so-called higher classes, who were not otherwise touched by the revival, were shamed into better living by the examples of those in lower stations. Green, one of the latest historians of the English people, says in his History:

In the nation at large appeared a new moral enthusiasm, which, rigid and pedantic as it often seemed, was still healthy in its social tone, and whose power was seen in the disappearance of the profligacy which had disgraced the upper classes and the foulness which had infested literature ever since the Restoration. A yet nobler result of the religious revival was the steady attempt, which has never ceased from that day to this, to remedy the guilt, the ignorance, the physical suffering, the social degradation of the profligate and the poor.

It dates, as we have seen, from the work of the Wesleys. Yet Wesley and his co-laborers were not what would now be

called temperance workers. They did not aim specifically at the evil of intemperance. They did not circulate the pledge, form an order, or organize a party. Their philosophy of the whole matter seems to have been that not drunkenness but sin in the human heart was at the last analysis the explanation of the manifold disorders of the time. They therefore called sinners to repentance, and bade them break off at once all their sins by righteousness, and their iniquities by turning unto the Lord. Mr. Wesley's published sermons contain few if any discourses on intemperance, but many on the depravity of the human heart, repentance, faith, judgment, pardon, and purity. Notwithstanding this want of directness of aim it was the most effective temperance movement of that or any other century. The labors of those who sought to restrain the evils of intemperance by education or force were not lost, but differed from the movement in question in that they were powerless without this, while this would have been a success without them.

Thus far we have been dealing with cold historical facts. If it be true that there is no way of judging of the future but by the past, then the logic of these facts is worthy of attention. The history of the eighteenth has already in part been repeated by the nineteenth century. The gross immorality and abounding drunkenness of the reign of George II. we pray and hope may never be seen again. Nevertheless, we have our drink problem. Of temperance reforms and reformers there has also been no lack. Some of these are already of the things that were. Of the old Washingtonian movement some good fruit remains, but the methods then in use are largely abandoned. The era of organization in temperance societies such as the Good Templars and Sons of Temperance seems well-nigh passed with the decadence of those organizations. The Blue Ribbon movement has spent its force, and yet the evil of intemperance remains in all its magnitude. A brief trial of high license has convinced many of its advocates that, however good it may be as a measure of revenue, as a temperance reform it is a failure. We are in the midst of a movement that is

"Bound to abolish original sin
By a bill that will bring the millennium in."

This, it is believed, State and national prohibition will accomplish. It is too early to predict the result save by a

glance backward to the eighteenth century. Already one State has receded from the position, and another is dangerously near, if not on, the political fence. The experiment of woman suffrage to vote the evil out of existence is, perhaps, after that to be tried. Progress has, in the meantime, been made in temperance reform; but which of these measures deserves the credit? May it not be that the real explanation is outside of them all?

A superficial view of the cause of any disordered state of society is likely to result in referring the disorder to some manifest abounding evil. Count Tolstoi refers all immorality to lust. Paul seems in one place to make the love of money the root of all evil. The Eastern mystic refers all to desire. The temperance specialist is prone to see in the love of and indulgence in strong drink a procuring cause of all evil. The drink habit is, in his thought, at least the tap-root, which, if it can be completely severed, this upas tree of sin must perish. According to this view falsehood, theft, and impurity are separate streams which have their origin in intemperance. If this is true, then plainly what is needed is to purify this poison Itasca. If, on the other hand, falsehood, impurity, and intemperance itself are streams flowing out of the black cavern of the human heart, then, plainly, little will be accomplished by attempting to dam up or dry up the river of intemperance. The great Reformer of Galilee had a profounder philosophy. To him the source of all evil lay back of any one of its manifestations. Hence, he did not cry or lift up his voice in the streets, nor form organizations directly to oppose the vices that were so manifest in his times, such as the social evil, the barbarity of the gladiatorial sports, the bondage of woman slavery, and drunkenness. He directed his teaching toward the fact that sin dwelt in and proceeded from the human heart, and then gave his life to provide a remedy.

It follows from such a philosophy that any great uplift of the human race must be born of a movement that touches men's souls and changes their hearts. Reforms must, moreover, go together, the advance being all along the line.

The easily besetting sin of the Anglo-Saxon race, reaching back to its childhood in the wilds of Germany, is love of strong drink. Wherever this light-haired, blue-eyed race has gone—

and it has gone almost every-where—this trait has been manifest. To “take away this bent to sinning” in a race strongest of all in its idiosyncrasies, no power has yet been found adequate but the power that wrought so mightily in England in the days of George II., and long before that made saints out of the vilest sinners of Corinth. It is sometimes said that national prohibition is the movement to which the Methodist Episcopal Church is committed, and on which it rests its hopes of relief from the evils of intemperance. In the measure in which the statement is true it is to be deplored as a departure from the policy of John Wesley and the Gospel. Giving the right hand of fellowship to all reformers, taking a position with the most advanced as to total abstinence for the individual and legal prohibition for the nation, it yet, we hope, depends for success on the power that originated and sustained the great temperance revival under the Wesleys.

Looking at the future of the temperance cause from this stand-point, the prospect is not as assuring as we would hope. Churches and ministers, hospitals and orphanages, Christian schools and colleges abound. This all looks favorable. On the other hand, there are those who think they see in the type of Christianity most prevalent in our day a growing lack of that spiritual power which made John Wesley differ from the fox-hunting parson of his day. They admit that there is something in the oft-heard cry about the alienation of the masses from the Church. We venture the suggestion, that unless something better is born—some more earnest and evangelical type of piety become prevalent—in a word, unless the nineteenth century is favored with as marked a visitation of the Holy Spirit as was the eighteenth—then the men of the twentieth century will be found struggling with the same old problem of intemperance.

Albert S. Todd

ART. VI.—THE OLD TESTAMENT AFTER THE BATTLE.

THOSE of us who have reached the age of sixty years—forty of which have been spent in biblical studies—can testify to the sharp critical battles that have been fought during the passing generation. Christian scholars have studied and struggled in necessary defense of God in creation and in revelation, in order to illustrate the divine existence and the divine origin of the Old Testament covenant. They have wrestled in learned discourse about the Absolute, about the Unknowable, about an Infinite and Eternal Energy as the creative cause, which was said to be a Force but not a Person, whose fiat peopled space with worlds and worlds with life. But, strange to say, some of us have met with Christians whose erroneous opinions were as difficult to correct as those of men who voiced creation by evolution and a law without a lawgiver. So we almost fear we may offend by expressing some thoughts which have occurred to us in the reverent study of years, and which attested facts seem to demand. We suggest a conference with all who seek truth rather than victory or pæans.

All right thinking must rest upon right foundations. Already we have gained this much in common; notwithstanding anthropology on the one side and agnosticism on the other, we all admit that God is partially incomprehensible by man, or man would be his peer in intellect. Long ago it was asked, "Canst thou by searching find out God? Canst thou find out the Almighty?" Never shall we forget the impression of a sermon on the "Sovereignty of God," preached by the late Dr. A. H. Vinton in St. Paul's Church, Boston. "What," asked the preacher, "can we finite creatures know about an absolute God? We know him only as he has been pleased to reveal himself in creation and in the Bible." Not otherwise can we find him. Never can we regard the Creator and Father of mankind as an absolute being, almighty, self-existing, self-willed, and dwelling solitarily in the depths of the eternities. But when he discloses himself as the Creator of the world we inhabit and of the vaster worlds about and beyond us, and as our Father also, then he stoops to our apprehension, appreciation, and love. Some such view as this, we apprehend, most thinkers take of God to-day. He is

infinite in energy and infinite in beneficence. His creative works tell us of him, and clearer still does his word.

Yet in the very first supposed page of that word human additions to it are misleading as to its character. Nor does the Revised Version correct the error, but still calls the Bible the *Old and New Testament*. And we are obliged to repeat the mistake in order to be understood. But God, the Jehovah of the patriarchs, is not dead, and has never died. His word is not so much his *will* as his *covenant*. A testament or will may bequeath us something, possibly with a duty to fulfill before receiving the legacy; but a covenant always implies a joint obligation between two parties who are put under conditions which they are jointly pledged to observe. Such is the marriage covenant; such was the covenant of circumcision; such is the covenant of grace. That is what our Father, God, has disclosed in his word. We have only to peruse the first eight chapters of our Bible, which, however, contain many precious promises, when we come to the covenant which God made with Noah and with his sons (Gen. ix, 8), and then in the fifteenth chapter we come to the covenant made by Jehovah with Abraham. The reader will enable us to save important space by reading and comparing these passages: Gen. ix, 8, 9; xi, 12-17; xv, 18; xvii, 2, 4, 7, and often through the entire elder Scriptures down to Malachi.

Now that covenant with Noah, with more explicit conditions made also with Abraham, was expounded still more fully by Moses, and was repeatedly enforced by a series of prophets. But when Jeremiah came a "new covenant" was promised, which should be richer and more spiritual in its provisions, and should be realized in the heart of the individual worshiper, as well as embracive of the entire nation of believers. This was also re-affirmed in the Epistle to the Hebrews, chapters viii-x.

And so, often and again, have pious Jews and Christian Gentiles earnestly pleaded with the great Father to *remember and look upon the covenant!* Surely that was not merely a *will* granting benefits, nor a *law* enacting penalties, but a *covenant* granting favors, entailing privileges, and securing temporal and eternal blessings! And it is precisely that, chiefly that, which is revealed to us in the Bible and which has been so carefully preserved for us. The mischances of revolution

and of exile, of persecutions and of transcriptions, have not yet eliminated God's covenant with man from his word. Nay, after the battle of a generation the covenant still stands.

Of necessity the divine word was given to man just as a great and good being would confer a favor, namely, in a language and style of speech which could be readily understood. To the Hebrew it was given in Hebrew, and to the Greek it was given in Greek; but at the first not in overwhelming portions, like Mr. Spencer's sesquipedalian definition of creation, nor in such infinitesimal morsels as to do no good, nor surely in the E., J., D., P., R. style, which like some crazy-quilts astonish or offend by their fantastic quaintness. No, but the revelation of the divine word and covenant for man has ever been with divine plenitude. Heaven's manifestoes to the world have been as full and as dignified as those of any earthly monarch, quite sufficient for the time and purpose. If instruction was needed, that was imparted—now to Adam, to Abel, to Seth, to Noah; now to Jubal and to Tubal-cain. So of the covenant with the saved man after the deluge; so with Abraham the chosen one, with his covenant of circumcision.

Abel had been taught how to offer an acceptable sacrifice, and Seth how to convoke worshiping assemblies. To Noah was given the token of peace, and now to Abraham is given the seal of perpetual covenant. Moses became the inspired legislator for Israel, Samuel the inspired reformer, David the inspired singer, followed by other singers and seers, but all in preparation for the grand covenant-tragedy on Calvary and the redemption of the world. Each disclosure pointed to that which succeeded it, from Moriah to Golgotha, from the crown of thorns to the crown of glory and heaven's welcome home.

And mark you, trustworthy literature of the covenant with Noah and with Abraham has been preserved to us in inscriptions, traditions, and memoirs which no respectable critic dare deny. The records of Abraham, the blood of circumcision, the slaughter of Hamor and the men of Shechem, the escape from Egypt, and the renewal of the covenant rite at Gilgal (Josh. v, 5-10) stand to-day perfectly intact, despite of all criticism. These are the marvels of history, and they illustrate the perpetuity of the Bible covenant. Add the sacramental pass-over and the daily sacrifice, and we have the essence of the first

six books of the old covenant. These witnesses are contained in monuments, and certified by institutions and by the Hebrew history for two thousand years. Samuel, David, and later prophets bear witness to them. So do the testimony of the conscience and moral sense of men; of the laws of being, or ontology; and of the fitness of means to ends, or teleology.

Properly, indeed, to correct mistaken ideas of God in creation, the Bible begins with the origin of things; how the heavens and the earth and man were created. Thus Accadians and Babylonians, Egyptians and Palestinians, learned the truth that God, the great Supreme over all, formed and adorned the world, and placed man upon it. This, in fact, may have been the original record of Noah as he learned it from his fathers or by the inspiration of God; or it may have been based upon what Abraham learned in Chaldea, but revised and rewritten by divine guidance and inspiration, for some strange fancies had already been mixed with the original account. Thus, according to the Cutha tablets of creation, there was a vast chaos or abyssmus (the *bohu* of Genesis), wherein swarmed gigantic monsters.

Warriors with the body of a bird of the valley, men with the faces of ravens, (these) did the great gods create. In the ground did the gods create their city. Tiamat (the dragon of chaos) suckled them. Their progeny the mistress of the gods created. In the midst of the mountains they grew and became heroes, and increased in numbers. Seven kings, brethren, appeared and begat children. Six thousand in number were their peoples. The god Banini, their father, was king; their mother was the queen Melili. The subjects and the offspring of these semi-human heroes the god Ner was deputed to destroy.

So Professor Sayce renders the account in his *Hibbert Lectures* (pp. 372, 373). And he says this Cutha legend belongs to the twenty-third century B. C., or the era of Khammuragas. The ideal circle of the great gods was then complete. Ea, Istar, Zamamu, Anunit, even Nebo and Samas the warrior, are referred to in it. The tablet was written for the great temple at Cutha, and a copy was made for the library at Nineveh.

Now this account, we may believe, traveled south and was known at Ur by Abraham. Hence he corrected his errors, but still retained his idea about the angels, some of whom are often mentioned in Genesis. But we go far astray in trying to relegate their first appearance to a period after the exile, when in

fact their existence antedates the migration from Ur. The oldest manuscripts and translations, secular history as read in Josephus, Tacitus, etc., and in the Pentateuch, Joshua, and later writers before the captivity, narrate angelic or supernal agency.

Professor Dana, one of the highest authorities in the United States, has recently treated the creation account in the *Old and New Testament Student* (July and August, 1890), since printed in a separate form. In conclusion he says:

The degree of accordance between science and the Bible which has been made out should satisfy us of the divine origin both of nature and the Bible. . . . The stately review of the ages making the Introduction to the Bible stands there as the impress of the divine hand on the first leaf of the Sacred Book. The leaf carries the history, in sublime announcements, onward to man; and then man, in his relations to his Maker.

Hence our conviction is strengthened that the creation records in Genesis were revised by Abraham, in order to correct the erring notions touching cosmic processes which were current among the peoples with whom he came in contact. Apart from modern science and the commentators we may believe the patriarch wrote all that was needful then to know, perhaps all that he was inspired to communicate about God in creation, and about angelic and satanic agency. These supernal powers were very early believed in by man, and the angelic beings mentioned may have been at the base of the thought which led ancient Babylonians and Egyptians to multiply the names for deity; but, says M. Maspero, "the Egyptians never multiplied God;" so also Wilkinson, Lenormant, etc. They acknowledged one self-existent Being, who had no second. Their seven great gods were but names for the seven archangels. And the fierce struggles which arose among those supernal beings and the "sons of rebellion" under a chief are vividly portrayed in the ancient inscriptions. But Bel Merodach conquered Tiamat, and Horus conquered Typho. The long-twisting serpent Apap was defeated. Still, he had been regarded as one of the works of God, but not an independent principle of evil, like Ahriman in later times.

From the important place occupied by these spirits they early came to receive adoration; but Mr. Tomkins says:

Animal worship was not older than a king of the second dynasty. . . . The oldest religion was not derived from a spirit cultus, for belief in God was before it; that of Osiris in Egypt, and that of the heavenly bodies in Babylonia. They were symbolized by Marduk, Istar, and Silik-mulu-Khi in Accad. Nana was only an old name for Istar, and Tasmit, of a later age, was the bridal goddess, the first-born of Uras. Nor was worship mere incantation; it was prayer, and prayer to gods who were thereby appeased.*

According to the *Saints' Calendar* the Babylonians had prescribed prayers and sacrifice for every day of the month Elul, and temple-worship for every day of the year. On the first day of Elul a gazelle without blemish was offered to the moon-god and the sun-god by the king or shepherd of the nation; daily to some deity there was worship up to the eighth day, when a sheep was sacrificed to Nebo; for other days of the month the victim is not named. The sacred animals were the antelope, the goat, the gazelle or roebuck of Moses, and the sheep. In Babylonia, in Egypt, and later in Palestine, there were daily sacrifices. Other sacred animals included so-called totems, some of which were hunted in the chase, namely, lions, boars, serpents, crocodiles, the hippopotamus, the red ass, and even men having red hair; the four last named were emblems of Typho in Egypt, as was the red fox in Japan and China.

As the Accadians attributed a living spirit, Zi, to sundry elements of nature, there arose a religious cultus for them. Hence totemism, if it ever really existed among them and the Egyptians. The spirit of the mountain, of rivers, even of trees, was a conception arising from the latent quality which they seemed to possess, and which lured, if it did not awe, the intent beholder. Thus the inviting fruit of the forbidden tree lured and tempted mother Eve, as well as the enticements of the serpent, to do what she knew was forbidden. Hence, we suggest, is the origin of "spiritism" in primitive times, and it is a rational explanation of all similar belief and practices. But, however that may be, must we not consider all these variations in worship and theology as departures from original instruction and right practice, derived from the example of pious Abel, from the teachings of Seth in his public assemblies, from the later offerings of Noah, and from sundry echoes of Eden?

* *Times of Abraham*, pp. 119, 120.

Quite early the Oriental nations had an Olympus and a pantheon. Yet Mr. Pinches tells us from the early inscriptions that the Chinese, who migrated from Chaldea in the twenty-third century B. C., have traditions of creation, of paradise, the tree of knowledge, the temptation by the serpent, of the fall of man, the curse upon him, ideas of Satan and angels, traditions of the deluge and the dispersion of mankind: these *ten* facts related in Genesis, which mark them out as originally belonging to the same ancestral home. It was also the home of Abraham. There, later on, the Semite preserved, if he did not introduce, a true conception of Deity, and lofty views of the divine government of the world. Sippara became famous for its worship at sunrise and at sunset, which, with Accad, was then governed by Semitic princes.*

Moreover, analysis discloses that the religions of Chaldea and Egypt were based upon and rooted in the idea of the divine unity, the first and sole Living Energy. All later ideas of theology and of lesser divinities were derived from this primal source of life and power. This "Energy" was known by one people as Ilu, by another as Amun or Tum, by another as El and Jah, each standing for the Kronos of the Greeks in their best days, and for the Jupiter of the Latins. Ilu was preserved in Bab-ili, "Gate of God," being the Semitic for the old Turanian "Cad-imirra." It was identified by that prince of Assyriologists, the late George Smith, with Alorus or Adi-ur, the first name in the list of Berosus, and means the god of Ur, which again suggests the early home of Abraham. The name is also found as that of two mythical kings soon after the deluge.†

This primitive agreement in the vast ideas of religion, as seen among the dwellers in Babylonia, Egypt, India, and Palestine, cannot be explained except by the admission of a common ancestral home and of a common faith in a monotheistic god. These dwellers also looked for restoration and blessedness with god in the land of the silver sky, or in the presence of Osiris, or of being gathered to their fathers, each implying supernal and enduring bliss. But of Mr. H. Spencer's evolution of religion, as of the evolution of worlds without a god, they had no con-

* See Professor Sayce's *Hibbert Lectures*, pp. 70-76, 320, 336-340; *Babylonish and Oriental Record* for January, 1890.

† See G. Smith's *Assyrian Discoveries*, p. 439.

ception, and all their ideas were contrary to it. If Mr. Spencer had but mastered these facts of the early inscriptions, and not confounded some practices of the era of Thothmes with the belief in the era of the great pyramids and their builders, he might have saved himself from the mistakes of his *Ecclesiastical Institutions*; for he claims to rest his argument upon historic testimony, but strangely mixes the testimony of modern Indians in America and distant isles of the sea with the primitive peoples of Egypt and the Orient, as though a practice now explained a practice then, and its origination. We hold that he can be answered in his own way by putting history against history, but insisting that it shall be contemporaneous history, and not one thousand to five thousand years apart, however distant as to place.

This argument from primitive history and the testimony of universal mankind is most conclusive touching the grand fact of a divine Creator; for it includes all the lines of proof: from conscience, or the moral argument, from ontology, from teleology, and all divino-anthropopathic and anthropomorphic considerations. It proclaims to man God as his Father as well as his Maker and Judge; the conscience, the affections, the intellect, and the soul's aspirations all testifying thereto and accentuating it; and they have so testified from Adam to this day. Our Lord added another confirmation to the long-acknowledged proof, namely, redemption through his blood and life eternal through his resurrection. For as science declares there can be no life self-evolved from matter, so the word of God teaches there can be no spiritual life, no immortality for man, unless the breath of God is again breathed into him. Spiritual vivification and sanctification are by the Holy Ghost. It is the soul's protoplasm, which nourishes to everlasting life. Only a God-made man can be immortal and possess eternal upholdings. This belief was more or less held by early mankind. To it the temples of Babylonia and Egypt bore witness. Because of it men prayed to Gar-ili or to Ra. They sang hymns to Ilu and to Osiris, to El and to Brahm; and they desired to live forever in the divine presence.

It assuredly counts for something, indicating the intelligence of those believers, that through the pure and clear air of Babylonia the unaided eye of man could observe the phases of Venus

as well as of the moon. Nature, with her thousand voices, taught them to acknowledge and adore the Creator of all. For them Anu had set his bow in the heavens and covenanted with the saved man after the flood. Wherefore man worshiped God, erected temples to him, offered him prayer and sacrifice, and endeavored to serve him, however imperfectly. There was no progressive development in these matters. Egypt had her Book of the Dead as well as Rules of Life, and Babylon her "Saints' Calendar." The earliest were even purer than the later teachings; and God was enthroned in the hearts of many of his children. It is opposed to the testimony of mankind that they ever developed their civilization from barbarism. In religion, as in physics, man has never lifted himself by his boot-straps.

Professor Maspero says:

Most of the sacred books were composed before Menes of the first dynasty, and have come down to us without many interpolations.

This was written in 1888. Professor Erman, of Berlin, says:

We cannot hold the view of the development of the literature of the dead. It arose in an epoch which lies almost beyond historical knowledge, and later times did no more than pass it on.

Moreover, the early practice of writing their ideas touching the living and the dead upon papyrus, prepared skins, or by inscriptions on stone, preserved at once all valued knowledge and a high regard for it. In discoveries and decipherments of immense importance the *Egypt Exploration Fund*, with other like endeavors, has made the world its debtor for the treasures of the past which it has brought to light; treasures, in fact, which underlie, illustrate, or confirm all that we have here considered, and without which our statements would be guesses for the most part, like those of Mr. H. Spencer's *Ecclesiastical Institutions*, or the errant notions of Professor T. H. Huxley on the Bible. These modern discoveries pulverize many of their vagaries, while they unfold the actual thoughts and deeds of primitive man: his loves and litanies, how he lived and labored, his memoirs and achievements, how he worshiped God by prayer and sacrifice, and how he looked for eternal blessedness with him in the region across the sacred lake or in the land of the silver sky.

How such ideas and aspirations first arose is clearly stated on the bricks and in the Bible—it was by divine instruction: by Thoth, said Egypt; by Anu, Bel, and Istar, said Babylonia. China and India had their inspired teachers, and so had Greece and Rome. In none was it self-culture; in all it was regarded as a divine impartation to man. So it was quite in accord with all that had been to that time that one should be appointed to preserve the true knowledge and worship of God in the world. Hence the choice of Abraham. It might have been some one else, but revelation in Genesis says it was Abraham. Said our Lord to the Jews, "Your father Abraham rejoiced to see my day; he saw it, and was glad." Surely that is conclusive, apart from the character of the visions and of the inspiration of the patriarch.

We are impressed by the fact that we are treading upon holy as well as debatable ground; how holy even our last Pan-Anglican Council dared not declare, while an executive member of our last Church Congress has since affirmed that Genesis was but a collection of myths and legends containing moral and spiritual lessons. Hence we have dwelt longer than we otherwise should upon the matters treated in order to lay sure foundations. How strong these foundation-truths touching Genesis are may be inferred by the fact that the knowledge of inscriptions corroborating them has steadily increased since Mr. George Smith's remarkable discoveries in 1872, then announced in London. Nor do we recall any cancellation of important confirmations arising from those decipherments since that time. Moreover, they led to Mr. Smith's conversion, for before he was a doubter.

Even while writing this paper another "find" has been translated, which proves the correctness as to fact of what Mr. Smith put forth as a provisional rendering of a name. The fact was the identification of Nimrod among the Chaldean legends, and the provisional name which Mr. Smith rendered "Izdubar" is now known to be "Gilgames." So Mr. Pinches, in the *Babylonian and Oriental Record* for October, 1890. Hereafter, instead of Izdubar and Gisdubar, Mr. Pinches, supported by Professor Sayce, will have us read "Gilgames." Professor Sayce says, "The name is evidently the same as that of Gilgames mentioned by Ælian." By a fortunate coincidence, Dr. W. H. Ward sends to the same *Babylonian and Oriental Record* copies

of the figures of two old Babylonian cylinders, which give the "picture of a boy on the back of an eagle, with his arms around its neck." It forms a part of the legends of Nimrod or Gilgames in the epic found by Mr. G. Smith in 1872. Nearly twenty years later his "find" and his identification are fully confirmed. It is no guess of the meaning of uncertain legends.

The authorities already cited, and this new confirmation of their general accuracy, although Nimrod-Gilgames has little connection with Abraham, who was some centuries later, do certainly indicate and suggest that memoirs were written by the patriarchs; memoirs which gave an inspired record of God in creation and of God in his word. Hence the whole Book of Genesis, except later revision of local references, is established and enthroned beyond the cavils of criticism. This conclusion also authenticates the divine covenant made with Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, which was confirmed with sundry additions by the inspired lawgiver.

Moreover, while the long series of chapters of the *Book of the Dead* may be read any way, the last or middle chapter first, and the first last, there being little connection or sequence between them, Genesis, from the eleventh to the fifteenth chapter, with one exception, follows naturally in connective sequence. That surely does not suggest an agglomeration of myths. Mr. Gladstone, in his last paper on the "Impregnable Rock of Holy Scripture," has hit Professor Huxley a blow from which he can hardly recover. It was a thought worthy of the writer's cunning to get a competent engineer to calculate the time required to drain the valley of Mesopotamia after a flood like that of Noah. The calculation sustains Genesis, but not Mr. Huxley. And the destructive flood in Sacramento about thirty years since, of many days' duration, is another refutation of scientific boasting. Thus routed on the deluge question, and by that sturdy old scholar, Dr. Adam Clarke, in his *Commentary on the New Testament*, which we read when a youth, on the swine of Gadara, whose raising and feeding were contraband to Jews, but which the scientist did not know, Mr. Huxley is also worsted touching his chronological assumption that the flood actually occurred in about the year 1600 after the creation!

Touching the date and fact of the Exodus, the most recent

decipherments, as generally understood, place the event in 1350 to 1300 B. C. And to it the word miraculous may be applied, for it was preceded by the institution of the passover and the death of Egypt's first-born, and culminated in the escape across the Red Sea by Israel. From the time of the settlement in Canaan, except when in exile, Hebrews went yearly to Jerusalem to keep the feast of passover, as did also our Lord. And for three centuries the Church of England, and the last century the Episcopal Church in America, have appointed Exodus twelfth chapter to be read at the morning service of Easter; yet at this service in 1890 one of her ministers in Massachusetts told his hearers that morning that he took his text from the *New* Testament because there was no historical reason worth considering to warrant his taking one from the Old Testament! I mention it here for the purpose of emphasizing the need of understanding what we preach about. That young man had probably never read a volume of the Egypt Exploration Fund's publications; for M. Naville, in the volume for 1885, identifies the store-city Pithom and the route of the exodus, also bricks of the era of Rameses II., some made with straw and some without straw, which confirms the record by Moses.

The volume of 1890, on the *City of Onias*, etc., by M. Naville and Mr. Griffith, of the same Egypt Exploration Fund, confirms both Isaiah and Josephus; that on Jeremiah's Tahapanes corroborates this prophet, while all illustrate some portion of Scripture and challenge the scrutiny of doubters. Moreover, readers of the *Iliad* will recall the frequent and precise repetition of commands and messages delivered word for word as first spoken. It is so in Exodus. Moses tells Bezaleel how to make the ark and its furniture, and in other chapters Bezaleel reports *verbatim* the finished work as directed. In the Book of Numbers stations or journeys are described as accurately as in the *Anabasis*; but in neither could the details have been given without full notes taken at the time. In Deuteronomy there are prophetic passages—as in chapter xxviii—which no late Hebrew could have brought himself to write, for the Hebrews were forbidden to eat human flesh; and in chapter xxiii are prohibitions, some of which they dared not and some they would not incorporate into a code of laws enacted when Nebuchadnezzar or Persian kings were their masters. To pretend that a political

and religious system could be embodied in Hebrew prophetic literature, attested by established institutions and sacramental observances, without the contemporaneous enactment of laws or statutes which included the vow of a Nazarite and the treatment of a criminal, the circumcision of a boy, and the duty of a priest—this may be dreamed of in the smoke of a study, but it was never a fact in the history of Israel. I am also sure that no Hebrew of the era of the exile and return could have written Deut. xxiii, 3, Neh. viii, and xiii, 1, for purposes of statecraft and religious exactness, nor have written Ezra, chapters ix and x. There must have existed an old-time standard touching such matters. So in the prayer of Abraham, "O that Ishmael might live before thee!" is the evidence of Abraham's self-respect as well as affection, and it points to an early writing quite in accord with the plea for Sodom. Invention of such things in a later age is the height of folly. What Jew, after the Ishmaelites became hostile to Israel, would have put such a request in the mouth of Abraham? The truth of the lesser parts of a record is in favor of the whole being true. Thus Ishmael confirms Isaac and Isaac proves Moses. But in commenting upon these historic records German criticism, especially that of Leipzig, is sadly deficient. It is overthrown, however, by monumental decipherments, which also account for many silly and now exploded criticisms of holy Scripture. However that may be, the text as well as the substance of Scripture, its purpose and character, Genesis, Moses, Samuel, and other prophets stand to-day in spite of all assaults. In a note received from the Rev. Dr. Driver, Regius Professor of Hebrew at Oxford, he writes:

I do not for a moment imagine that Isa. liii, and lxi, 1-3, refer to Cyrus. In *Isaiah, His Life and Times*, pp. 177-180, I consider them to be fulfilled by Christ. As regards lxi, 1-3, the only question is whether the prophet is to be supposed to be speaking or the "servant of the Lord." I prefer the latter alternative. Nor do I suppose that any part of chapter xl relates to Cyrus. I only suppose Cyrus to be referred to where he is named or obviously alluded to, as in xli, 2, 25; xlv, 28; xlv, 1-5, 13; xlv, 11.

This is strong testimony against those who explain the last twenty-seven chapters of Isaiah as a record or history of what was fulfilled in the restoration from Babylonia. Much of it refers to the coming Christ.

Of the prophet Daniel a new champion has appeared in the Laudian Professor of Arabic at Oxford, D. S. Margoliouth. Invited to measure critical swords with Dr. T. K. Cheyne and Dr. Driver, he has produced such linguistic proofs and illustrations of an early date for Daniel as to convince those gentlemen that he may be right, and that if they had known of his reserved defenses they would not have controverted his inaugural lecture. This recalls a story told by General Banks when he canvassed Massachusetts in order to defeat the great Whig party. Some new voters, he said, had joined it, but they would find themselves like certain passengers who had booked for a distant town. For on the way their coach was overturned; and they said to one another, "If we had known the coach was going to tip over we surely would not have got in!" So these learned professors would not have attacked young Margoliouth's lecture if they had known he had such a store of defenses to protect and sustain him. See his proofs in *The Expositor* for April and May, 1890. See also Professor Sayce's letter in *The Sunday-School Times* for December 13, 1890.

Thus in review of the entire Old Testament battle-field liberal orthodoxy holds the fort. *All that Hebrew patriarchs and seers have voiced touching divine covenant and an inspired record of visions and teachings*, which the critics have tried to eliminate or destroy, *stands intact at this hour*. Not one iota of essential text relating to God in creation, to God in converse with Noah, in covenant with Abraham and Israel, has been weakened by the encounter. But every promise from Eden to Olivet has been realized or is being fulfilled. The covenant word remains unweakened. It is the coach of the critics that has tipped over, and some of them wish they had never got in it.

Edward Cowley -

ART. VII.—CONSTITUTIONALITY OF PARAGRAPH
ONE HUNDRED AND NINETY-THREE.

WHEN a traveling preacher is so unacceptable, inefficient, or secular as to be no longer useful in his work, the Conference may request him to ask for a location; and if he shall refuse to comply with the request, the Conference shall bear with him till the session next ensuing, at which time, if he persist in his refusal, the Conference may, without formal trial, locate him without his consent, by a vote of two thirds of the members present and voting; *provided*, however, that in no case shall a preacher be located while there are charges against him for immoral conduct.*

The *Methodist Review* for July-August, 1890, contains an elaborate argument by Dr. Potts against the constitutionality of the above paragraph. The teaching of that article and of other articles criticising the same paragraph is not only antagonistic to the constitutionality of the paragraph, but is subversive also of one of the fundamental principles of our ecclesiastical organization and polity; to wit, the supreme and final authority of the Annual Conference over Conference relations, Conference membership included. Dr. Potts boldly attacks the paragraph and the General Conference also. This is his central charge against both:

The General Conference of 1880 not only legislated at variance with constitutional law under analogical limitations, . . . it enacted a law directly in conflict with one of its own constitutional limitations.

The "constitutional limitation" with which this statute is assumed to be in conflict is the first clause of "the fifth restrictive rule:"

The General Conference shall not do away the privileges of our ministers or preachers of trial by a committee, and of an appeal.

Even a cursory reading should satisfy any one that there is not the slightest conflict between the two. The "paragraph" relates to Conference membership alone, which the restrictions of the "rule" do not embrace. The restrictions of the "rule" apply to the privileges of trial and appeal provided for in Part iii, chapters i and ii, of our Discipline, and which are possessed alike by all preachers previous to, during, and subse-

* Paragraph 193, *Discipline of the Methodist Episcopal Church*, 1888.

quent to any Conference membership, and which the "paragraph" in no way affects.

But the General Conference of 1880 did not enact any statute on this subject. It simply amended a statute of many years' standing, so as to throw around those liable to action under it safeguards they never had before, and transferred it from the *penal code*, where it never belonged and with which it never harmonized, to its own proper place in the Discipline.

As it is detailed in the *Review* article, the so-called "history of this strange piece of legislation," by which these changes were effected, furnishes strong inferential evidence, at least, of the constitutionality of this statute, rather than any evidence—as the writer infers—that the highest legislative and judicial body of a great Church was going patiently through the most careful consideration of this whole subject for weeks, "expressly to devise a way" by which it might outrage "one of its own constitutional limitations," and "enact a measure squarely intended to deprive certain ministers of their rights under the constitution."

Assuming the unconstitutionality of the statute, the writer seems to hold that one of the greatest bishops, as well as one of the purest and kindest men ever produced by Methodism, joined with an entire General Conference in an unholy conspiracy against a helpless victim. He says of Bishop Simpson and the General Conference of 1884:

It would seem that both parties set out to miss the mark, and succeeded, while Seneca Howland went down before their shots.

Let us see just what foundation there is for this terrible calumny, as furnished by the writer himself:

The New York East Conference, at its session in 1881, requested Seneca Howland to ask for a location. He failed to comply with the request. Consequently, at the session of 1882 a resolution was introduced to locate him without his consent.

The resolution was adopted, over two thirds of the members present voting in the affirmative; but during the pendency of the resolution objection was raised, and the Bishop ruled "that the case had a right to proceed." "At the General Conference of 1884 this case came up on appeal" from the ruling of the Bishop, and was referred to the Judiciary Committee. The

ruling of the Bishop and the action of the Conference were sustained by the Committee, and the General Conference adopted their report. To evade the force of this conclusive action the writer pleads :

It will be observed that neither Bishop Simpson in his ruling, nor the Judiciary Committee in its finding, passed upon the constitutionality of the law, as the objection in the Annual Conference contemplated, but only upon the lawfulness of the Conference action as related to Paragraph 183 [193] of the Discipline.

The absurdity of this evasion must be apparent to all. The constitutionality of the law was the only question before the Bishop, the only question upon which he could rule. It was the only question involved in the appeal referred to the Judiciary Committee, and the only question upon which it could "pass." There was no question as to whether the *law* was being *lawfully* administered. The only objection raised was,

That Conference could not legally take such action, because the fact required in Paragraph 183 [193] has not been ascertained by this Conference by any proper or judicial investigation, and therefore the proceedings now proposed are not in order.

Here the sole ground of the only objection raised is the assumed unconstitutionality of the statute by reason of its lack of provision for what the minority regard as essential—that is, a formal trial, a *judicial* trial, with privilege of appeal.

Section 9, Paragraph 161, of the Discipline makes it the duty of the bishop presiding

To decide all questions of law involved in proceedings pending in an Annual Conference, subject to an appeal to the General Conference.

The only question of law involved in this case and decided by the Bishop was the question of the constitutionality of the law under which action was being taken, as the language of the writer clearly puts the case, and as the appellants, the Judiciary Committee, and the General Conference clearly understood the whole subject. Those who knew Bishop Simpson or know his character know that no man has lived who was farther above disingenuousness or evasion in a case of this sort than he was ; but there was no room for either here. But two ways were possible to him, and he must accept the one or the other :

either he must affirm or he must deny the constitutionality of the paragraph. Denying the constitutionality of the law would be to arrest proceedings. Simply allowing proceedings to continue under the law would be to affirm its constitutionality. The Bishop did more than that: he "ruled upon its constitutionality, as the objection in the Annual Conference contemplated," when he decided "that the case had a right to proceed, because the requirements of Paragraph 183 [193] had been answered by the Conference." If answering the requirements of the paragraph gave the case a *right* to proceed it could only be *because* the paragraph was in harmony with the organic law of the Church, and not unconstitutional, "as the objection in the Annual Conference" charged. The appellants knew that the ruling of the Bishop was an official indorsement of the constitutionality of the law, and took their appeal on that ground, and not on the ground of evasion or disingenuousness in the ruling.

The Judiciary Committee understood perfectly that the appeal from the ruling of the Bishop referred to them was taken because that ruling decided in favor of the constitutionality of the law, and framed their report accordingly. Nothing could be more directly to the point than that report:

We find that the ruling of the Bishop, and the action of the New York East Conference in locating Seneca Howland without his consent, are in accordance with the law of the Church.

The Committee could not mean to say, as Dr. Potts has it, that the ruling of the Bishop was in accordance with statute, the constitutionality of which he was asked to decide by the ruling. Nor could they mean to say that the action of the Conference was in accordance with the statute, the constitutionality of which was *the* question before the Bishop and before them. Of course it was in accordance with that statute; nobody denied that; but was that statute in accordance with the law of the Church? That was the question they were to decide; and they did decide that it "is in harmony with the law of the Church," which they could not truthfully say if it contravened the "fifth restrictive rule," or any other organic law of the Church. By the adoption of this report the General Conference placed the highest possible indorsement upon the

constitutionality of this paragraph. If that action was not the final adjudication of this case we have no way of settling constitutional questions; we have no tribunal authorized to decide abstract questions of law.

The law of our Church as seen in § 9, ¶ 161, is, that the bishop presiding shall "decide all questions of law involved in proceedings pending in an Annual Conference, subject to an appeal to the General Conference." The action of the General Conference in all such cases is final. There is no appeal from that action to a subsequent General Conference or any other body, by raising abstract questions of law, or in any other way.

Notwithstanding, however, the authoritative settlement of the above case by the General Conference of 1884, Dr. Potts tells us that he "submitted to the General Conference of 1888 a memorial calling attention to the unconstitutionality of ¶ 188 [193], and asking that it be referred to the Committee on Judiciary." Strangely enough, it was referred, and the Committee promptly reported, "That in our opinion the said paragraph is unconstitutional;" but, being unable to give a satisfactory reason for their opinion, the report was recommitted on the spot; and within a very short time it apparently dawned upon the Conference that an inadvertent blunder had been perpetrated in receiving and referring the memorial, which was corrected, so far as possible, by a resolution relieving the Committee of the consideration of all abstract questions.

The reason given by this memorialist for memorializing Conference on this subject is the strangest part of the whole matter:

To obtain a decision from a competent authority, in order, if possible, to settle the point forever that any legislation designed to ~~deprive~~ Methodist ministers of their Conference rights without form of trial is unconstitutional.

The wonder is how the General Conference of 1888 could be more "competent authority" than either or both the last two preceding; how, if the memorialist had succeeded in obtaining a decision from that body, it could have "settled the point forever," when the emphatic indorsement of the paragraph by the General Conference of 1880, and also of that of 1884, had utterly failed to settle any thing for him. But it seems that the

General Conference is not *his* ideal "competent authority;" and that while he failed to obtain any thing from that body but the recommittal of a report, he tells us that he did obtain *about* all he was seeking in the "opinion" of the Judiciary Committee. Can any one guess how the opinion of the Judiciary Committee of 1888, in which the General Conference did not concur, can be "competent authority," when a carefully prepared report of the Judiciary Committee of 1884, adopted by the General Conference, was no authority at all? Yet upon that bare opinion, not accepted by the General Conference, and for which the Committee itself was unable to give a satisfactory reason, the writer tells us, "The case is clear and practically settled" against the constitutionality of this paragraph. To support this remarkable conclusion, for which there is not the slightest foundation, the writer found it necessary to invent this bit of pure fiction:

The Judiciary Committee of the General Conference bears close analogy to the judicial department of our general government, which has authority to adjudicate upon the question whether acts of legislative or executive power are in conformity with the requirements of the fundamental law.

The judicial department of the general government has such authority, and is a permanent, co-ordinate branch of the general government; but the Judiciary Committee of the General Conference is nothing of the kind, has not a particle of such authority, and there is not the slightest analogy between the two; and yet the writer has no better foundation for his argument than that figment.

The question of real importance at issue in this discussion is the question of authority. *Is the authority of the Annual Conference to locate a useless member final, or does the final authority belong elsewhere?* In other words, is it the prerogative of each Annual Conference to decide as to the fitness of its own members for its work, or may the Church at large take that matter out of the hands of the Conferences and decide for them? A careful study of the subject will satisfy any one that this authority belongs, and ought to belong, to the Annual Conference. The moral fitness of laymen or ministers for membership in the Church is a matter of jurisdiction belonging to the whole Church. Hence the right of a court of

higher and broader jurisdiction to review on appeal the findings of a court of primary jurisdiction. Of the fitness of acceptable members of the Church for the peculiar work for which the Annual Conference exists that body ought to be the best judge, and its judgment ought to be, as constitutionally it is, final. No Judicial or General Conference has any more right to say that an Annual Conference shall retain a member who "is so unacceptable, inefficient, or secular as to be no longer useful in his work" than it has to say that such Conference shall receive such a person into full membership. Nor has any Judicial or General Conference any more right to reverse the decision of an Annual Conference, or to receive and try an appeal therefrom, in the one case than it has in the other. Properly interpreted, the legislation of the Church has always harmonized with the possession by the Annual Conference of supreme authority over Conference relations.

Paragraph 182:

No elder who ceases to travel without the consent of the Annual Conference, certified under the hand of the president of the Conference, except in cases of sickness, debility, or other unavoidable circumstance, shall on any account exercise the peculiar functions of his office, or even be allowed to preach among us: *nevertheless*, the final determination in every such case is with the Annual Conference.

Paragraph 192 provides that a superannuated preacher living beyond the bounds of his Conference, and failing to forward the required certificate of his "Christian and ministerial conduct," may be located therefor without his consent. If any one of these, and many other similar statutes in the Discipline, is unconstitutional, it should be this last named, which provides for the involuntary location of a possible veteran superannuate; but neither of them is unconstitutional, as, by the law of the Church, "The final determination in every such case is with the Annual Conference." The argument of this paper is sustained by the highest authorities of the Church.

The Annual Conferences, of course, are but executive bodies except in some cases which relate to their own internal regulation.*

The Annual Conference holds the power of discipline over its own members.†

* Bangs's *Vindication of Methodist Episcopacy*, p. 139.

† McClintock & Strong's *Cyclopaedia*, vol. vi, p. 171.

They (the Annual Conferences) are also authorized to elect proper persons to elders' and deacons' orders, to determine the relations of preachers as supernumeraries and superannuates, and in given cases to locate them.*

The Annual Conference has the undoubted right to place a member in the supernumerary relation without his consent and against his protest.†

It has been affirmed that an itinerant minister in our Church has no legal church membership except his Conference membership. The assumption of this affirmation is that because an itinerant minister has no other legal church membership therefore he is entitled to privileges of formal trial and appeal on his Conference membership. This assumption contains the important concession that privileges of formal trial and appeal intervene only where church membership is assailed. The concession is correct, although the assumption is false. Membership in the Methodist Episcopal Church is a complete entity, independent of and apart from any Conference membership. The General Conference of 1888 understood that matter correctly. "Has a Methodist preacher, who has not been located for five full years, such membership as a layman in the Methodist Episcopal Church as the Discipline requires in order to eligibility to election as a lay delegate in the General Conference?" was a question referred to the Judiciary Committee of that body. The Committee reported: "Yes; provided he has been a member of the Church for five consecutive years;" and the Conference concurred in the report. Thus the integrity and continuity of church membership in or out of the Annual Conference was affirmed. So it is in Paragraph 71:

In case any member of an Annual Conference be deposed from the ministry without being expelled from the Church, he shall have his membership in the Church where he resides.

The voluntary or involuntary location of a traveling preacher does not divest him of a single privilege of trial or appeal which was his during his Conference membership. When he was received into Conference he was invested with full privileges of trial and appeal, and he departs with the same as complete as they ever were. We have an excellent system of jurisprudence

* Bishop Simpson's *Cyclopedia*, page 41.

† Report No. VI of Judiciary Committee, adopted by the General Conference of 1888.

within which a member may change from one grade to another either way—that is, from layman to traveling preacher, and from traveling preacher to layman, without gaining or losing any thing at all so far as privileges of trial and appeal are concerned. The system possesses a set of courts for each grade, and the member is always under the jurisdiction of the courts for the grade to which he at any time belongs.

Again, it is assumed that a traveling preacher, by virtue of his Conference membership, “is a stockholder in whatever material values the Conference may own,” and is thereby invested with “constitutional rights” of which he may not be deprived without formal trial. If that assumption were valid it might require a civil rather than an ecclesiastical trial to divest him of such rights; but it is not valid. *The Conference does not own any “material values.”* The Conference, with all it holds, belongs to the Church; and a layman is as much a stockholder in any such values as a traveling preacher. Retirement from the itinerancy does not divest a member of one cent of financial ownership. The Conference does not hold “material values” for the Church by any such tenure as to constitute its members stockholders with constitutional rights as such. Even claimants on “Conference funds” have no “vested rights” in these claims. If they had, all “superannuates,” “widows,” “orphans,” would be “constitutional” claimants on such funds. In our economy such funds are a measure of the Church’s beneficence bestowed upon the deserving needy. The wealthy have no claims, and it is competent for the Conference to disallow the claim of any one. There is then absolutely nothing in the relations, purposes, or organization of the Annual Conference by which, or for which, the restrictions of the “fifth restrictive rule” can apply in any way to Conference membership.

The constitutionality of Paragraph 193 will be still more thoroughly vindicated by comparison. “The formula . . . which . . . did not suit the special committee,” but which the opponents of this statute seem to regard as the nearest perfect of any yet devised, refers the case of a “traveling minister accused of being so unacceptable, inefficient, or secular as to be no longer useful in his ministerial work . . . to a select number of nine . . . who shall investigate the case during the session of the Conference, and if they, upon the evidence, . . . judge the

complaint well founded, the select number may, if the accused will not voluntarily retire, locate him without his consent." Here the complaint is to be investigated at the Conference session, where it is heard of for the first time; and the subject of the complaint, if the committee of nine "judge the complaint well founded," is to be located then and there, not by a two-thirds or even a majority vote of the Conference, but by the votes of five of his fellow-members. There certainly could be no fairness in a procedure like that; but it will be claimed that the formula provided for an appeal. True; but it did not provide for a trial, and no appeal can be entertained except from the verdict of a formal trial. If the formula had been adopted there is no court that could possibly entertain an appeal from the "judgment" of a committee of investigation that a complaint was well founded. If the complaint involved a triable offense the judgment of the committee might furnish ground for a trial, but not for an appeal.

This paragraph, which has been the law of the Church on this subject for a half century, was very defective until its amendment in 1880. Previous to that a "traveling preacher was liable to investigation and involuntary location at the Conference session at which he was first accused of being "so unacceptable, inefficient, or secular as to be no longer useful," by a bare majority vote; nor was there any possibility of lawful appeal, for the reason above given, that there can be no appeal except from the verdict of a formal trial, for which this statute contained no provision; neither was it included in the provisions of the statute authorizing appeals. "In all cases of trial and conviction under the provisions of Paragraphs 203-211 an appeal shall be allowed to a Judicial Conference" was the language of Paragraph 233, Discipline of 1876. The paragraph now numbered 193 was embraced in those paragraphs, but as it contained no provision for a trial, and as there could not be any "trial" or "conviction" under its provisions, there could not be an appeal. When a trial is intended in our jurisprudence it is clearly specified. We have but one trial formula for ministers of the traveling connection, that of Paragraph 222, and that is for immoral conduct. The penalty on conviction of guilt as charged is expulsion from the Church. Modified guilt may justify modified penalty; but whatever the measure,

it is penalty awarded as the finding of a formal trial, with expulsion from the Church as the full measure of penalty contemplated in the trial.

Other paragraphs contemplating a trial expressly place the case under this formula. For "improper tempers, words, or actions," preliminary steps are ordered, with a view to the averting of a trial; but if these fail, the then incorrigible offender is arraigned by express direction of the statute for trial under the provisions of Paragraph 222, with expulsion from the Church as the penalty on conviction of guilt as charged.

Paragraphs which do not make such reference for trial do not contain any provision for trial. There is no provision for any formal trial in our Church except for cases affecting moral character and involving membership in the Church. The action contemplated in Paragraph 193 cannot possibly be in the nature of a trial, as it does not in any way relate to moral character or involve church membership. Therefore there cannot be any conflict between that paragraph and the "fifth restrictive rule," the provisions of which include cases for which formal trial is provided and no others. A good moral character is essential to any preacher located under this paragraph. No pending trial can be superseded by action under this statute, but action under this statute at any stage may be superseded by a formal trial. Hence, while the allegations of this statute furnish no grounds for formal trial, they do furnish sufficient grounds for an investigation, and, if need be, for involuntary location.

The wisdom of transferring this paragraph from the penal code to its proper place in the Discipline cannot be doubted, but the treatment it has since received from a few brethren reminds one of the lamb that was forcibly herded with kids so long that when at last it got with its own kind some of the under shepherds failed to recognize it as a lamb and began pelting it with stones, although it never looked or acted like any thing but a true lamb.

It must now be clear to the reader that there is no conflict between Paragraph 193 and the fifth restrictive rule of our Discipline, and that the assumed unconstitutionality of that paragraph, which was predicated solely upon the alleged conflict between the two, entirely disappears; but, to make the matter still more transparent, if possible, let us examine the "rule"

itself a little more critically. The "rule" restricts the General Conference from doing certain things. This paragraph, enacted by the General Conference, cannot be in conflict with the "rule" unless it contravene some of its restrictions. "The General Conference shall not do away the privileges of our ministers or preachers of trial by a committee, and of an appeal," is the only restriction of which it is said by any to be violative. Let us see if there is any violation here. All "our ministers or preachers," ordained and unordained, traveling and local, are included in this restriction. Certainly the local preachers of our Church cannot be excluded. They are not included in the expression "our members" in the other clause of the "rule." The General Conference never classifies or designates them in that way. They are eligible as lay delegates in the Electoral and General Conference, but that is by special legislative interpretation. It was not so when this "rule" was framed. They have never been classed as laymen for purposes of trial and appeal. If they do not come within the restrictions of the "rule" as "ministers or preachers," they do not come within those restrictions at all. Whatever the General Conference is restricted from "doing away" from "our ministers or preachers," it is restricted from doing away from any of them. Of course, that must be something that belongs alike to all of them. That cannot be any thing pertaining to Annual Conference membership, as very many of them never have any such membership, but they all have perfect equality in all the franchises of church membership, including "privileges" of trial and appeal. If there had been the least intention to include Conference membership in this restriction the "rule" would have read "our *traveling* ministers or preachers." In no other way could it be limited to that class. Even then Paragraph 193 would not conflict with the rule, unless it was also specified that no *traveling* "minister or preacher" shall be involuntarily located without formal trial, with privilege of appeal, and that would subvert a fundamental principle in our ecclesiastical organization.

This "restrictive rule" confers no privileges of trial or appeal; it simply restricts the General Conference from doing away those already in possession of our ministers and members. The privileges in possession of "our ministers" are those only which are provided for in Paragraphs 222-232 and 256-265

of our Discipline. Any legislation of the General Conference which does not impinge in any way any of these privileges cannot possibly be in conflict with this "restrictive rule." Neither the enactment nor the administration of Paragraph 193 conflicts in the least with any of these privileges.

The traveling preacher located under this statute has, during the process of its execution as well as subsequently, all the privileges of trial and appeal provided by our law, or guaranteed by the "fifth restrictive rule;" all that legally he ever had, or could have, perfectly intact. Who then shall dare to say that there is the slightest conflict between the "restrictive rule" and this paragraph, or that the paragraph is unconstitutional?

The principal arguments of the critics of our paragraph are not against its constitutionality, but against some conceived possible danger of injustice in its administration. They raise the question of constitutionality and then proceed to discuss the question of administration. There is no reason why there should be any more danger of injustice in the administration of this than of any other statute in the Discipline. The fairness of the administration of law depends principally upon the fairness of the administrators. If there is a tribunal on earth at the hands of which a Methodist traveling preacher is sure to receive justice tempered with the tenderest mercy it is his own Annual Conference. The objectors confound *trial* and *investigation*; and because the paragraph contains no provision for a trial they charge that it contains no provision for an investigation. Our Discipline never uses *trial* and *investigation* as synonyms. The fact is, the language of the paragraph, "when a preacher is so unacceptable," presupposes investigation before the Conference is authorized to "request him to ask for a location." And it is unjust to suppose that any Annual Conference or bishop presiding would refuse any member the largest liberty of representation, personally or by his friends, during such investigation. The Church has a right to expect that Annual Conferences will exercise their powers humanely and wisely as well as firmly. Any law may be abused without being in itself liable to any complaint whatever.

Allen A. Eu

EDITORIAL NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS.

OPINION.

IN A LITERARY POINT OF VIEW it is important to understand the style of the various writers of the books of the New Testament. In its broadest sense this implies a critical study of several things, such as the thought of the writer, the grammatical structure of his sentences, the extent and limitations of his vocabulary, and the intended meaning of what he wrote. Thoroughly mastering his style by this process the student not only attains a knowledge of the individualistic peculiarities and attainments of the respective writers of the books, but he will be indirectly aided in a correct interpretation of the teachings they contain, the latter being the end of his investigation and study. On the whole, it may be said that the literary style of the New Testament is classical, as it may be said that the style of the Old Testament is Hebraistic; but a minute study of the several writers of the New Testament will result in the discovery of Hebraistic and Aramaic elements, which, though they do not impair the general classicism under which they wrote, did exert sufficient influence on the minds of the writers to deserve attention. Critically, or analytically, we must therefore recognize the Hellenistic, Hebraistic, and Aramaic philology in these writers; the first as dominating and all powerful in the expression of the truths of the Christian system. In Matthew the Hebraistic element is very conspicuous; in Luke the scholarly or classical prevails, with Hebraistic touches in his hymns and discourses; while in Mark the three elements are on exhibition with enough of Latin words to show that the writer was a philologist of some rank. In both John and James the Greek is employed to represent in the one the transcendent thought of God, and in the other the ethical ideals of religion. Various styles are observable in the Epistle to the Hebrews, but they are rather the styles of various authors than of various languages. It is also noted that while the writers are individualistic respecting their own psychological conditions, temperaments, and qualifications, and therefore differing one from another, they at the same time, when writing concerning the same history, or amplifying the same doctrines, exhibit in many instances a similarity of style or certain resemblances in diction and thought that prove a unity in their work and guarantee it from embarrassing contradictions and irregularities. No one can fail to see that Luke and Paul think in the same logical manner and write in the same stately form, as becomes their themes. Jude and Peter approach a suspicious philological likeness, while Peter himself resembles John, James, and Paul, according to his mood or subject. We say nothing as to the conjecture of having in some books not the original language of the writers but a translation of a lost original, as Matthew's Greek gospel is supposed by some critics to be a translation of a Hebrew

original, for in such a case the general peculiarities of style would be retained. The conclusion is, that a critical study of the style of the writers will open the way to a knowledge of the writers and to a higher knowledge of what the New Testament teaches.

THE DOCTRINE OF THE LEADERSHIP of the Holy Spirit is explicitly taught by Paul in two of his chief and undisputed epistles. In Rom. viii, 14, he says, "For as many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." In Gal. v, 16, 25, he says, "This I say then, Walk in the Spirit, and ye shall not fulfill the lust of the flesh. If we live in the Spirit, let us also walk in the Spirit." Without quoting other passages it is sufficient to state that this doctrine, though fully enunciated by Paul, is a general doctrine of the New Testament, and has been accepted by the Church as positive and fundamental. What is most manifest is, that divine leadership is confined to the sons of God, and is a proof that those under the divine direction and protection are the children of the Most High. When studied in the double aspect it will become the source of a new inspiration to the Christian believer. He accepts the teaching that leadership is limited to the saints; but he is not in the habit of reasoning that such leadership is a proof of their personal harmony with God. For this latter fact he depends upon the witness of the Spirit, or upon answered prayer, or upon providential intervention; but the apostle would add to these evidences that which arises from the divine leadership of men. The fact that a man is led by God is proof that he is one with God, is God's child, with inherited privileges and resources. The doctrine, however, needs to be guarded and apprehended in its limitations in order to avoid false conclusions. Leadership is in accordance with prescribed rules and principles as revealed in the word of God. One is not so led by the divine hand as to dispense with self-guidance within human limits, or to ignore human cautions, discriminations, and the judgments of life. "Led" does not involve self-sacrifice, or the sacrifice of human inclinations and human wisdom. God often leads through human influence, sometimes by natural agencies, certainly by the divine teachings, and rarely by independent supernatural manifestation or intervention. The Spirit is leader, not in a miraculous way, but in harmony with truth, wisdom, equity, and righteousness. In general the Spirit's leadership—his methods, plans, purposes—is revealed in the written word, by which it must be determined and declared. To hold that spiritual impressions may supersede the written word is to open the door to the worst forms of fanaticism, from which the Church has not been entirely free because of false interpretations of the doctrine now under consideration. Such a man as Paul might possibly confide in his spiritual impressions, and accurately determine their divine meaning; others, in later ages, with the most delicate spiritual discernment may have read the will of God in hints, dreams, visions, and unseen indications; but the average believer must interpret his impressions by the word of God, and recognize divine leadership only in its direct correspondence with the written revelations. This will prevent hypocrisy, fanaticism, hallucinations, and all forms

of spiritual error which, discarding the divine word, have sought authority and justification in alleged visions and spiritual manifestations entirely incompatible with the imperative and comforting doctrine of Paul.

THE PRESERVATION, IMPROVEMENT, AND DEVELOPMENT of society make a problem of no mean magnitude. Ever burdening the thoughtful in all ages, it rests with heavy weight in this time upon the statesman, the civil ruler, the evolutionist, the sociologist, the theologian, and the Christian student. To apprehend it properly it must be separated from the problem of civil government; for while government and society are co-related and interact, possessing, indeed, similar features and functions, they are, nevertheless, sufficiently dissimilar in origin and final cause to require distinct consideration. Society is the word that expresses the normal condition of man. He is its subject; he is born amenable to its spirit; and whatever the civil government he is in affinity with, his social environment yields to its ever-immanent influence. Government is the word that expresses the organized purpose of society in its relations to the individual, and is rather the result than the efficient agent of social laws and conditions. Society is primary; government is secondary. Society is constitutional, inherent, functional; government is artificial, logical, and necessary. The problem of society, therefore, is simply the problem of primary or functional conditions. Expanded in its true form it implies the development of society on an ethical basis, or the development of an ethical system according to the primary laws of man's social nature. Darwin held that the ethical spirit of the world is the flower of the social instinct, reversing, as it seems to us, the natural order of the development of man's moral history, which is founded, not on his social history, but on the higher, indisputably regnant facts of consciousness and a moral judgment. If it is true that moral law has no other source than the social impulse—if human ideas of right and wrong are alone traceable to the inworking of the social relations—then it is not surprising that upon the discovery of this fact divine law lost its authority in some circles, and the decalogue was banished from politics and civil life. In proportion as the source of ethics is recognized as divine or human will social development occur, either widening into larger and richer liberty or tending toward social degeneracy, contracting into narrow and selfish temporalities and enjoyments. History presents the singular anomaly of society subsisting in perfect harmony with the destructionism of sin. The two have jointly occupied the same territory and reigned with mutual consent over the same subjects. Nations have preserved themselves for centuries in spite of the sins that distinguished them from their neighbors, and partook of their fruits as if they were the sources of their perpetuity. Sin is a moth, slowly, silently, but progressively destroying the virtues, the honor, and the integrity of a people; but they sin on and take pleasure in unrighteousness. The stability of a nation is secured, not by its material forces, but rather by its harmony with those ethical principles that underlie the moral safety of the individual; and any drifting from this

foundation will imperil the future of such a people. The modern sins of intemperance, Sabbath-breaking, prostitution, and political corruption will as surely be followed by national disaster as the ancient sins of idolatry, tyranny, barbarism, and general misrule were followed by national sedition and dissolution. We are not pleading for an American system of ethics, for the ideas of right and wrong have a higher source than national conviction and legislation, but for the more widely spread recognition and authority of such teachings as are embodied in the decalogue and the New Testament. These are adequate to all the demands of society, and faithfully observed will insure its perfect development and its complete conformity to the ideal state of man as revealed in the Book of books.

THE METHODIST DEACONESS IS THE PRODUCT, not of a sensational movement in religious circles, but of existing spiritual conditions that the last General Conference was broad-sighted enough to recognize, and upon which, when considered, the order was officially established. She takes her place in the Christian activities of the age in response to a providential call that neither she nor the Church could refuse to hear. The order means the utilization in organic form, and by the authority of the Church, of the reserved forces of the Christian sisterhood and the official direction of their moral resources and labors to specific ends. Not the least beneficial effect of the new institution will be the stimulating of Christians in general to more methodical work in the vineyard; and it is altogether probable that multitudes who have lived aimless lives will catch the spirit of the new workers and contribute their unused energies to human progress and happiness. Methodism is not excelled by any Protestant body in its power of organization; and it now proposes, by an organized agency, to influence the humble and needy, and impress upon them the beauty and necessity of religion in a way and by agencies that can scarcely fail to result in advantageous changes in the social and religious habits of thousands. It will take time to make apparent the benefits of the order and to perfect the organic structure of the movement. Already its imperfection is manifest, and embarrassments will constantly arise until another General Conference shall remedy the deficient legislation. The order as constituted by the Discipline is practicable in cities; it is difficult of establishment in villages and rural districts. The relation of the Annual Conference to the subject, and the machinery advised or ordained, need to be reconsidered and re-adjusted before a working order can be fully secured. With its imperfect legal equipment the order in its initial stages is exhibiting its possibilities and demonstrating its usefulness. What was accomplished fifty years ago by Fliedner in Germany may be more than duplicated in this country by the deaconesses who go forth, bearing the precious comforts and teachings of the Gospel with them, to assist those in degradation, poverty, and spiritual destitution. The present quadrennium will justify the establishment of the order of deaconesses; the next quadrennium will perfect it in its institutional aspects, and exhibit results commensurate with the expectations of the Church. In view of this new

opening to Methodist women for the exercise of the religious spirit, it behooves them to consider, inasmuch as the pending controversy relative to their eligibility to the General Conference seems in many minds to involve the question of their relation to the ministry, if they cannot accomplish all for the Master within this new sphere, together with a wise use of the other opportunities already accorded them, without rushing beyond scriptural limitations into spheres not so palpably warranted to them. It is at the least plausible that, as teacher, deaconess, and evangelist, woman may find enough to do without disturbing the ministerial order and character of the Church. To these other duties she may be providentially called, and so varied are their activities, so extensive the relations they suggest to human society, and so spiritual and permanent the blessings and results that will follow their observance, that Christian women should be satisfied with what will then be their place and privilege in Methodism. Let them at least show what they can do as evangelists and deaconesses before they clamor for ministerial robes and pulpit investments.

THE OPEN DOOR TO A NATIONAL LITERATURE is the nation that produces it. To be able to interpret the former one must understand the spirit, temperament, education, and inward life of the latter. Literatures cannot be measured, analyzed, and determined by a single standard, for while all possess common properties and develop according to universal laws, every literature is within certain limitations as much the product of its environment and the national bias as of universal law or the common basis of thought. Hence, German literature must be studied in the light of German culture, and as the result of German life. English literature has for its starting-point and ever-guiding influence the impulse of English historic development. American literature points to sources peculiarly native in explanation of its rapid evolutions and its large promises of future results. Not one of these literatures can be interpreted by the canons of the other, nor can all of them be valued by the same or common rules of development or analysis. The German mind is subjective; the English mind is objective; the American mind is both subjective and objective. The first inclines to theology and philosophy, or speculative study; the second prefers science and history, or the practical branches of inquiry; the third is at home in any department, and is free with any subject of thought. The German has a wide field, but it is narrowed by his subjective tendencies; the Englishman is the external thinker, preferring material phenomena to spiritual data, and soon reaches limitations; the American can write on any thing, because he feels not the pressure of boundaries, and can follow both the German and the Englishman into their respective spheres of inquiry and knowledge. Kant is German; Macaulay is English; Bancroft is American. In these one beholds literatures based on universal law, but at the same time each expressing an inalienable national characteristic. In the study of literature, therefore, it is important to discover the intellectual life of the nation, as upon this basis all that is permanent in prose and poetry finally rests.

CURRENT DISCUSSIONS.**OF THE USE AND VALUE OF "THE FATHERS."**

CONCERNING the value and authority of the writings of the eminent men known in ecclesiastical history as "the Fathers" various and opposite opinions have been, and still are, maintained. Archbishop Usher esteemed them very highly, and commended them to students of divinity as eminently worthy of their most careful reading because of the light they threw upon the origin and growth of the various heretical opinions, doctrines, and ceremonies which had crept into the Christian Church in past ages. Archbishop Wake, while repudiating the Romanistic theory of their "equality with the Scriptures," and of their authority as teachers of doctrine, regards them as having value, in that, despite the errors which disfigure many of them, they show, at least incidentally, that the leading doctrines of the Christian Churches of to-day have been the "common belief" of Christian communities from the beginning. But he very properly denies that their nearness to the apostolic age gave them any more right to decide upon what is the true faith than is possessed by Christian thinkers of to-day, since their opinions must be tested by the same rule as ours, namely, by the word of God.

On the other hand, as Richard Watson observes, some equally learned men have placed them "in the very lowest rank of moral writers, and have regarded their precepts and decisions as perfectly insipid and in many respects pernicious." This estimate, if it included all the ancient Fathers from Clement of Rome to Augustine, cannot be maintained. It is altogether too indiscriminative. It may be accepted, however, with slight qualification, as a correct statement of the intrinsic worth of the writings of Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Polycarp, Ignatius, and the Shepherd of Hermas, who are historically designated as the "Apostolic Fathers," because they were acquainted either with the apostles themselves or with their immediate disciples. The works of these followers of the inspired apostles are regarded by ecclesiastical historians generally as "very little worthy of confidence, because of the uncertainty respecting their genuineness." But even if genuine they are so obviously the productions of men who, though truly pious, yet, as Mosheim correctly observes, "possessed little learning, genius, or eloquence," that they have small literary or theological value. Farrar, also, says of their writings that they are "not works of genius, and possess no great intrinsic or literary value. But they are characterized by a glowing faith and a noble moral tone. They largely consist of direct exhortation and simple statements of doctrine." Nevertheless, they are important as historic witnesses to the existence and authenticity of the gospels and epistles to which they constantly refer, and to the doctrine, life, and organization of the Christian Church in the age immediately succeeding the death of the apostles. Further, their literary defects, when contrasted with the writings of the

apostles, serve, like the background of a picture, to bring into high relief the immense superiority of the latter in "originality, power, and wisdom into the light." The best of the former, as Canon Farrar says of the letters of Ignatius, seem to be incomparably beneath the humblest of the New Testament writings.

The Fathers of the second century are known as "the Apologists," because they sought by their writings to defend the fearfully persecuted faith and usages of the primitive Church against those abusive misrepresentations and blind misunderstandings which intensified the rage of the emperors and of the people generally against Christianity. The writers of these Apologies, including Quadratus, Aristides, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athanagoras, Hermias, etc., were mostly men of higher culture than the "Apostolic Fathers." Yet, says Farrar, "they were neither inspired nor infallible, nor were they in general men of commanding genius or exceptional insight." Trained as they had been in anti-Christian schools of thought, they were not able to grasp the "evidences of Christianity which arise from its inherent supremacy over the conscience and the springs of human action." Yet they did what they could, pleading nobly, eloquently, and earnestly for the sublime faith which public opinion ruthlessly distorted into a creed unfit to be accepted by philosophers and injurious to the welfare of society.

During the third, fourth, and fifth centuries many able men historically known as the ante-Nicene and post-Nicene Fathers, and including Tertullian, Cyprian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Athanasius, Gregory, Ambrose, Chrysostom, Augustine, etc., wrote with varied eloquence, learning, and skill in defense and exposition of the Christian faith. Of these, as of the before-mentioned Fathers, it must be said that their chief value to the modern Church lies in their testimony to the fact that the books of the New Testament were universally regarded by the Christian Church of those early centuries as the authenticated writings of the men under whose names they were then, as they are now, current in the world. Not only did these Fathers quote largely from both the epistles and the gospels, often crediting their citations to their respective authors, but they also frequently referred to them as to books that were well known, authentic, and accepted as authoritative standards of Christian truth. They spoke of those writings not as merely human compositions, but as having the seal of inspiration upon them. Hence they habitually named them as "Holy Scriptures," "Divine Scriptures," "Fountains of Truth and Salvation," and as being every-where read in their religious assemblies. Moreover, those books accepted as sacred were catalogued by Origen, by Eusebius, by Cyril, and finally by Augustine and by the Council of Carthage in A. D. 394. This latter catalogue, as were those of Athanasius, Epiphanius, and Jerome, contained all the books now in our New Testament. The genuineness of a few of them had been called in question by some of the earlier Fathers. But after diligent and discriminating inquiry had secured evidence invalidating the suspicions of the few objectors to two or three of the books, all of them were received into the canon.

Reviewing with scholastic caution the efforts of the primitive Church to guard the canon against the intrusion of aught that was unauthenticated, Dr. John Dick in his "Lectures on Theology," judiciously observes:

If the testimony of these primitive Christians should be pronounced insufficient in these circumstances there is an end to all confidence in human veracity, and it will be impossible to prove the genuineness of any book in the world. The truth is, that no book has come down to us from ancient times so fully attested as the Christian Scriptures.

The student whose tastes and pursuits incline him to read the Fathers, from Clement to Augustine, finds much in their writings to interest, instruct, and profit him. They represent the movement and development of theological thought during the first three centuries. They show the perverting influence of the ancient philosophies on Christian doctrine, and the power of the monarchical principles of the times over the concepts of the Church respecting ecclesiastical organization and hierarchical authority. They contain much to stimulate spiritual affections and heroic self-sacrifice for the sake of Christ and the Church. But with all these excellencies they combine many marked defects which seriously deduct from their aggregate value. Their gold is adulterated with injurious dross. Their profoundest thoughts are often blended with vague notions; their wisdom is not seldom eclipsed by folly; their intellectual strength is allied to much weakness; their logic is yoked to fanciful rhetoric; their interpretations of Scripture are invalidated by unsound criticism and unskilled exegesis; their concepts of divine wisdom are obscured by the vagaries of pagan philosophy; and their piety damaged by association with unscriptural and unreasonable asceticism. Hence their testimony as to what is truth is utterly unreliable, and the teaching of some is contradicted by that of others. Almost any doctrine and usage can find support from some of them. Therefore, though they are witnesses they are not judges. Where they testify to existing facts they may be believed; but their expositions of Scripture, their doctrinal teachings, and their definitions of duties are of no authority until they are tested by the supreme word of God.

In his *Lives of the Fathers*, Farrar refers to an article by Quarry in the *British Quarterly Review* as his authority for the statement that "the views of the Church as to formal theology, as to Scripture interpretation, and as to her own position and authority, were mainly molded in the first three centuries by five men. Three of these were bishops—Ignatius, Irenæus, Cyprian; two, far greater in intellectual power, were only a teacher and presbyter—Clement of Alexandria and Origen. To the first three was due in great measure the long-prevalent theory of ecclesiastical organization and hierarchic influence; to the last two the philosophic treatment of the truths of theology and the fixation of the allegorical method of explaining Scripture. The former aimed at establishing a catholic unity, the latter a catholic science."

In this perspicuous statement, the historic correctness of which will not be denied by any candid student of ecclesiastical history, we have a clew

to the source of those extravagant opinions respecting episcopacy which in the Latin Church logically culminated in the papacy, and which has begotten in the Anglican and in the Protestant Episcopal Churches a proud sense of hierarchal superiority that debars it from entering into fellowship with other Churches. Those opinions are not streams of thought flowing from Christ and his inspired apostles, but from the alleged teaching of Ignatius, Irenæus, and Cyprian. They do not cite Clement, who preceded Ignatius, because, as Lightfoot has shown, Clement in his "epistle" used the terms *episcopos* and *presbuteros* as synonyms, and Ignatius was the first of the Fathers to make a distinction between them. And even Ignatius, though extravagant in his demands for submission to episcopal authority, did not describe episcopacy as monarchical or diocesan; nor did he teach the "historic fiction" of bishops endowed with authority to teach and hand down a deposit of truth in unbroken succession, as Irenæus, who came after him, asserted on the basis of alleged but untrustworthy tradition. Cyprian, whom Farrar designates the Coryphæus of the Latin Fathers, pushed the contention of his predecessors to the absurd conclusions of sacerdotalism, claiming that bishops have supreme dominion over the Church, and constitute "a sacred caste by divine right."

Unprejudiced thinkers cannot but perceive the folly of pretensions founded on the assertions and reasonings of these ancient Fathers. To such it is self-evident that if all of them, from Clement to Augustine, had contended for hierarchal church government their contention would be valueless so long as the theory and example of the apostolic Church stand out, as they clearly do, in obvious hostility to their assumptions. But the Fathers were not all high-church men. Lord King, who made a special study of their writings with respect to the constitution of the primitive Church, found that the distinction between bishops and presbyters was little more than nominal, because their powers were the same. From the Fathers themselves he proved that besides the right to preach and administer the sacraments both classes presided in consistories, excommunicated, confirmed, and ordained, and that they were of "the same specific order as bishops, having the same inherent right to perform all ecclesiastical offices." In this judgment King is sustained by the direct testimony of Jerome, one of the most learned and judicious of the Fathers, who says distinctly:

A presbyter is the same with a bishop. Before, by the instigation of the devil, there were parties in religion, the Churches were governed by the common consent of presbyters. But afterward it was decreed throughout the whole world that one chosen from the presbyters should be set over the rest, to whom the whole care of the Church should pertain, that the seeds of schism might be plucked up.

Hence, Jerome being judge, episcopacy was not divinely commanded, but was devised by man "solely upon the principles of expedience."

Thus it is apparent that on the vexed question of episcopacy the Fathers were divided among themselves. They may be quoted by both high-churchmen and Presbyterians in favor of their respective theories of ecclesiastical

government. They are of use as showing through whom those diverse theories originated, and by whom they were developed; but they cannot be appealed to as witnesses whose evidence is decisive of the issues involved in the ecclesiastical differences of the ancient or modern Church. In fact, those issues are only obscured when viewed in the uncertain light of their contradictory opinions. Tradition ought not, therefore, to take the place of Holy Writ, which is the sole authority by which these issues can be determined. Neither should that divine word be interpreted by the Fathers, as Newman and his Tractarian brethren insisted it should be. The Book itself, freely investigated by the reason, and enlightened by the wisdom which is freely given from above to prayerful souls, is the only sure and safe guide to the solution of ecclesiastical problems.

The *theological* value of the Fathers is mainly in their records of the reasonings by which the few simple but sublime facts which constitute the Gospel, and their apostolic elucidation, were developed into scientific form. Some of those writers—as, for example, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, and Athanasius—were profoundly acute reasoners, learned, especially in Greek philosophy, and thoroughly acquainted with the Scriptures. There is much in the productions of their facile pens that is admirable, instructive, and suggestive. Origen, despite his speculative errors, as Canon Westcott observes, “fixed the type of a popular exposition. His *Hexapla* was the greatest textual enterprise of ancient times, and his treatise on *First Principles* the earliest attempt at a systematic view of the Christian faith. Both in criticism and interpretation his labors marked an epoch.” Athanasius, famous as the author of the Nicene Creed, the adoption of which by the Council of Nice saved the Church from being swept into the vortex of Arianism, is justly eulogized by Dr. Farrar as “having received the ungrudging admiration not only of the Church but of the world.” Others of those Fathers were also men of rare ability. Still, when their collected writings are studied, they are found to abound in such peculiarities of opinion, such false theories of Christian faith, such misconceptions of the nature and practice of piety, such abounding errors of exegesis and exposition, and such erroneous presentations of the fundamental principles of the Christian life as to make them unfit guides to unwary seekers after truth. One whose theological opinions are deeply rooted in sound interpretations of the divine word may profit intellectually, and perhaps spiritually, by browsing among them; but to one whose views of doctrine are unsettled they will prove a labyrinth from the bewildering windings of which there is no safe outlet, except one retains enough of the inspired word to be a clew to a path out of their manifold obscurities to the sunny table-land of the truth as it is set forth in the deep yet simple utterances of Him who was himself the Way, the Truth, and the Life.

The folly of looking to those ancient Fathers for clear expositions and sound scientific statements of the truth revealed by Christ and explained by his inspired apostles is apparent to one who notes the fact that the most influential of them had been trained in the schools of Hellenic philosophy before he entered the school of Christ. As the influence of a training in

the rabbinical schools of the Jews showed itself in the stubborn Judaistic prepossessions of the apostolic band, so does the influence of the profound but imperfect and erroneous philosophy of the Greeks and of the Oriental theosophies show itself conspicuously in the Fathers. Instead of explaining their philosophy in the light of the glorious Gospel, they, perhaps unconsciously, sought a key to the inner meaning of the Gospel in the philosophy. The consequence was a serious perversion of Christian truth. By mingling the dross of philosophic errors with the pure gold of the Gospel they incorporated false principles into their speculative views of that Gospel which became the germs of most of the characteristic errors of modern rationalistic thought. Dr. Allen, in his brilliant but in many respects misleading work, *The Continuity of Christian Thought*, writing of what is sometimes called "the new theology," affirms that it marks a quiet revolution, compared with which that of the sixteenth century was insignificant." And then, speaking of the sources of this alleged revolution, the extent of which he very extravagantly magnifies, he says:

As we review the leading features of the theology, which has been gradually extending its reception in the Church from the time of Schleiermacher, it appears in every essential aspect as a reproduction of what Greek theologians had taught when the influence of Christ was yet fresh in the world, when the Christian intellect was quickened as if by a supernatural impulse, when as yet the teaching of Christ had not been modified or economized, reduced or disowned, by the interests of ecclesiastics claiming authority to teach and govern the world in his name.

This passage rightly concedes the very significant fact that the so-called new theology is essentially a reproduction of Greek theology through Schleiermacher. But it is not strictly true that the Greek theology originated just when "the influence of Christ was yet fresh in the world, and while his teaching was as yet unmodified." The father of the Greek theology was Clement of Alexandria, who was not born until about A. D. 155; consequently his teaching was not a power in the Church until the close of the second century. Hence, considering the then prevailing popular ignorance and the general intellectual apathy outside of philosophical circles, it is not apparent that "the influence of Christ was [then] fresh in the world." In an age which had never even dreamed of a printed book, a century and a half stood between even a divine fact and its influence on the unthinking millions like an almost impenetrable mist. As to the teaching of our Lord, Professor Allen correctly affirms that it was as yet unmodified by "*ambitious ecclesiastics*," but this does not prove that it retained its original purity when transmuted into Greek theology. On the contrary, as the learned Neander affirms and the Professor himself admits, it was seriously modified by the Platonic and Stoic philosophy, with which Clement of Alexandria sought to make it acceptable to the philosophic heathen of his times. And it is this philosophical modification of the Gospel of Christ by Clement, and subsequently by Origen, which, having been reproduced by Schleiermacher, is now claiming the ear of the Church under the boastful and specious name of the "new theology." Placed in the light of the old Gospel it is assuredly new, since, though it retains

some ancient and fundamental truths, it also contains principles which neutralize their ethical force, and tend to emasculate the piety of those who embrace it.

The rationalism which seeks to undermine the foundations of Christian faith by denying the inspiration of the Bible has its roots in the teaching of the Alexandrian Clement. His method of treating this vital question is not by a positive denial of its claim to be a divine revelation, but he narrows the scope of that claim by placing it on a level with Greek philosophy, which, he says, "contained a direct divine revelation," albeit in Paul's estimation it was the wisdom by which the world "knew not God." In Clement's view the higher activities of human thought and reflection are the only process by which the revelation of truth is conveyed to man. Inspiration is the God-given insight which enables men to read aright the truth which God reveals, and this is the same in the sacred writings as in Greek philosophers. Thus he makes no distinction between natural and revealed religion—between what man discovers and God reveals. By such assumptions Clement robs Holy Scripture of its claim to be a special revelation of God through holy men whom he illuminated and moved to write truths undiscoverable by the natural powers of the human mind. Thus, by exalting the productions of human genius, he minimizes the exceptional value and denies the divine authority of the holy men who wrote as they were moved by the Holy Ghost. And it is by reasoning on his unproven and unsound premises that modern rationalism attempts to justify its pretense that the writings of Milton, Shakespeare, Bacon, and other men of genius were as really inspired as the books of Holy Scripture. On this theory, also, they rest their claim of right to subject the Bible to the canons of literary criticism, and to determine its claim to be a revelation, not by the historic evidence that its writers were supernaturally endowed men, but by the verdict of the human consciousness concerning its teachings. They go to it, not as the Psalmist did to hear what God spake, but to learn whether, in the judgment of their own consciousness, its statements are or are not inspired! All authority for spiritual truth, they assert, "lies in its last analysis in the consciousness of man!"

Finding Clement on this broad platform, one is not surprised to find him explaining the facts and doctrines of Scripture by the judgment of his own consciousness. To the consciousness of his wholly unbelieving countrymen these facts and doctrines appeared to be "foolishness." To his consciousness they were authoritative only when interpreted in harmony with his mental concepts of what a revelation should be, and with the demands of his emotional nature. Hence, not being possessed by that profound perception of the deeply malignant nature and ruinous effects of sin which is the basal fact of Holy Writ, he is unable to perceive any essential difference between the justice which demands its punishment, and cannot consistently pardon without a sacrificial expiation, and the love which seeks to save the sinner who believes in the atoning death of the Lamb of God. Therefore he implicitly denies the reality of God's

anger by resolving it into a mode of loving. In keeping with this concept is his rejection of the doctrine of human probation, which pervades both the Old Testament and the New, and his theory that all life is an education by which God is seeking to make men understand that their relationship to him is not broken, but only temporarily obscured. This educational process is to continue beyond the grave until all men are persuaded to recognize it. As to a general judgment or final assize in some remote future, it is not needed, because the education of the race is to be continued even after death, until its universal purity is secured. The judgment, in his view, is a present continuous element in the process of human education, and its peculiarities, like all the penalties of sin, are remedial!

Origen, also, taught Clement's doctrine of the final salvation of all human beings. He even went so far as to include evil spirits in his theory of the divine mercy. "He taught," says Farrar, "that all sentient beings, even the evil spirits, would be ultimately brought into union with God, although there would be future retribution—not for torment, but for amelioration—and that all evil would be finally purged away like dross in a baptism of fire, or in the probatory flame of the final conflagration."

These citations suffice to show that our modern teachers of rationalism and of liberal theology are not the originators, but only "the gatherers and disposers" of the theories of those Fathers who, says Mosheim, "sought to find the causes and grounds of every Christian doctrine in their philosophy." In a later age the results of their speculations were visible in the hair-splitting scholastic and the passively contemplative mystical theologies. To-day their revived opinions are sapping the foundations of Christian faith, and leading the age either into outspoken skepticism or into religious professions based, not on faith in Christ's propitiation and on the experience which works out personal salvation "with fear and trembling," but on sentimental theories and false views of duty which are both spiritually feeble and ethically superficial. It may be noted, further, that as the Platonic and Stoic philosophy shaped the theology of Clement, so did the dualistic principles of the Persian magi influence the theological system of which Augustine was the father. This famous teacher, before his conversion, had embraced the theories of Manes, who had sought to explain Christianity by the pessimistic principles of the magi. Hence, says Dr. Farrar, "the theology of Augustine was penetrated through and through with dualism, and for the majority of the human race with practical despair." Out of the effects of his early belief in this false philosophy came his extreme views of human depravity; of man's absolute separation from God through the offense of Adam; of the predestination of an elect few to eternal life; of the doom of the majority of mankind to eternal torment; of the irresistible nature and partial operation of grace, and of all the peculiarities of his theology which, if true, would rob Christ of his glory, God of his goodness, and the majority of men of all hope of peace either here or hereafter. It is true that his views, when first promulgated, were regarded as novelties, since "they had hitherto been held never, nowhere, and by none." Nevertheless, they triumphed in the Latin

Church, excepting his very extreme dogma of total depravity, which the Christian Church has generally rejected because it has believed that "through the light that lighteth every man that cometh into the world" the human will is free to accept or reject the Gospel, through which "whosoever will may be saved."

It is not necessary to note others who rank as Fathers in ecclesiastical history. Enough has been said to make it clear beyond all honest cavil that there is no uniformity of doctrinal or ecclesiastical opinion among them. Their views of Christian truth were as varied as their countenances and environments, and were shaped more by their education in opposing schools of philosophy than by their unbiased study of the divine word. Some of them saw the truth in whole or in part, as it is in the gospels and epistles. Others saw it deeply shaded by the errors of paganism. There is no heretical opinion or rationalistic theory working in the mind of the present age of which the germ may not be found in the writings of some one or more of those historic men. Hence, as observed above, they can be quoted by all parties in behalf of any truth or in support of any error, by high and low churchmen, by Calvinists and Arminians, by Chiliasts and anti-Millenarians, by Trinitarians and Unitarians, by Universalists and believers in the everlasting punishment of impenitent souls. Therefore, to accept their teaching as being in and by itself conclusive proof of any creed or dogma is folly. Their opinions prove nothing but that they were held by the individuals in whose writings they are found, and by their contemporaries. They have no more authority than the opinions of equally good and learned living men. Their value must, in every case, be determined by their agreement or disagreement with the words of the Lord. Therefore, to study them profitably, one must compare them with critical care with those inspired words, and mark the causes, philosophical, educational, and social, which tended to lead them away from the exact truth into the manifold heresies which mar their beauty and detract from their value. Thus used, they may serve to guard one against the prevailing errors which are their progeny, and to bind one more closely to that everlasting word which is the only authoritative standard of revealed truth.

It is well, in conclusion, to remind the "higher critics" that, while they have persistently accused orthodox teachers of binding themselves too closely to the past, and of being influenced by the beliefs and traditions held by the "Fathers," it turns out, after a faithful examination of what the Fathers taught and held, that the critics themselves have been followers of traditions and believers in the errors of the Fathers. It equally follows that the orthodox teachers are really the original and independent teachers, less influenced by the vagaries of the Fathers than the "higher critics" themselves. We trust this exposure will have a restraining effect hereafter on the boastful tendencies of such critics, who pride themselves on progressive instincts and original acquirements, and that the orthodox party will with more positiveness rebuke the supercilious attitude of men clinging to ancient errors.

WAS JOHN WESLEY THE FOUNDER OF AMERICAN
METHODISM?

IN the progress of the American commemorative observances respecting John Wesley, to whom, very properly, many things are attributed, it is important to pause and, with due discrimination to historical facts, consider his relations to American Methodism, and its actual indebtedness to his agency or influence for its initial movement and subsequent development. This suggestion for a re-survey of a specific question is made in no spirit of antagonism to the claims generally made for the providential founder of Methodism, nor in a spirit of criticism of the just and noble, if in some instances excessive, tributes recently paid to his character and achievements. Admitting the exact truthfulness of nearly all that has been pronounced concerning his immense services to the cause of Christianity, we are justified in recognizing certain co-operative agencies without which his work would have been in vain, and especially without which American Methodism would appear a very inferior factor in the religious history of the New World.

Without controversy, Mr. Wesley was *de facto* the originator of Methodism. Assign any measure of influence to his mother or brother, it remains that he, as no other, was the introductory agent of the new religious movement to the world. To dispute this fact is to dispute history. In the development of the movement, however, it is strictly historical to say that it became English in spirit, form, and general features, with tendencies to expansion, if not universality. It took to itself national characteristics, if not a national embodiment, just as the Church of England took an English form with tendencies to world-wide conquest. In the restricted sense, therefore, English Wesleyanism, and *not world-wide Methodism*, is the natural, legitimate, and intended product of Mr. Wesley's original religious movement. No fact more patent to the student of history has been so perpetually overlooked as the limitations of Mr. Wesley's original work.

In English Wesleyanism we discover all the essential ideas of its founder, such as doctrines, church government, itinerancy, the quarterly meeting, class-meeting, a lay ministry, and the publication and circulation of religious literature. Respecting the institutions, usages, discipline, teachings, custom, and spirit of Methodism, they are to be found in English Wesleyanism, not as germs, but as the fruit of the established order, suggestion, and organized resources of the Church under the direct superintendence and undisputed authority of Mr. Wesley. In examining original Wesleyanism, however, as the reflection of the original spirit and purpose of the movement, we see that in many particulars it does not correspond with American Methodism; but differs as widely from it, especially in its form of government, as if the two Methodisms had nothing in common, or, at the least, were unrelated in their general aims and features. It is necessary, therefore, to inquire into this difference, to ascertain if the two movements originated from the same source, or if each had an independent

origin, and, possessing original and independent potencies and resources, accomplished in its development an original and independent purpose.

Compelled to study the question, it is not from the motive of disparaging Mr. Wesley's services to America, or to dissolve his so-called relation to American Methodism; but we hold it not unwise to announce what his services really were, and to discover what his relation to our Methodism actually was, so that we may accord to his memory the praise that is due, and at the same time truthfully accord to our Methodism what belongs to it in its founders, agents, and successes. It is not in dispute that Mr. Wesley was not present at the birth of American Methodism, nor did he instigate its appearance or suggest any agency through which it came into existence. In intention he had no more to do with it than he had with the later introduction of Methodism into India. Methodism, *in embryo*, had a representative on this continent in Mr. Whitefield, who, nearly thirty years before Barbara Heck, astonished the people in the great cities from Savannah to Boston with his marvelous eloquence and his wonderful revival power over the multitudes. He visited this country several times, at first as genuine a Methodist as Mr. Wesley himself, but later surrendered to the Calvinistic influence. Justice requires not merely an acknowledgment of his earnest labors, but that for a time at least they were Methodist in character, and might, under proper co-operation of Mr. Wesley, have resulted in the establishment of Methodism on our shores. Incompetent as an organizer, and failing to conserve the results of his prodigious services, it is but just to recognize Whitefield as a pioneer in the religious history of America. Nor is Philip Embury only to be mentioned in connection with others. He had not been altogether idle or forgetful of duty when the incisive exhortation of Barbara Heck aroused him to increased effectiveness. Nevertheless, we have not yet found the date of the origin of American Methodism. The inchoate period of Whitefield is not the starting-point, but Philip Embury leads to it. Historically, our Methodism first appeared when Barbara Heck, Philip Embury, and Captain Webb determined upon a religious crusade in 1766 in New York. It was a spontaneous movement, American in spirit, without a single English impulse, without any Wesleyanism in it save that these Christian people were products of the English revival. But it would be unwise, because these people had felt the force of the Wesleyan movement, to attribute to it the American revival, because, on that basis of interpreting movements, we might go back in all instances of conspicuous promoters to those who had educated or initiated them into their life-work. With no other plan of interpreting history we could adequately give credit to no instrument or agency, but be compelled first to ascertain the antecedent and contributing influences or agencies, and ally them with remote and final results.

The founders of American Methodism were the three persons named—a woman, a soldier, and a preacher; all of whom were the products of the English revival, but none of whom was sent to this country as a missionary or had any mission to organize a society or extend the Wesleyan move-

ment. Not until 1769, or three years later, and then by request from America, did Mr. Wesley recognize the religious work inaugurated in New York, when, with the approval of the British Conference, he sent two preachers, Boardman and Pilmoor, to aid in its extension. Francis Asbury, though sent to America as a missionary, did not arrive until 1771, and in 1772 was appointed as Wesley's "general assistant" in America. Gradually, and by the exercise of the appointive power, Mr. Wesley assumed the oversight of the work in this country; but he planned nothing, and rather restrained than ordered the development of the Methodist societies rapidly multiplying in the new field. He was willing that his appointed preachers should preach, organize societies, introduce some of the English customs and rules, but he was unwilling that they should administer the sacraments or establish a Church. Under his control and direction Methodism, notwithstanding the people gladly heard the divine word and thousands were converted, was dwarfed and gave little promise of expansion into a strong and commanding Church. Whatever the motives of Mr. Wesley, he was slow in discovering the necessity of organizing a Church or giving to Methodism a concrete form. Save his unfortunate visit to Georgia he never visited America, and governed the American societies with an inflexible rigidity that resulted in loss, in long delays of needed changes, and in postponement of organization. Left to himself to determine the fate of the Methodist societies, it is not certain whether he would have organized them into a Church—for he was averse to founding a Church—or continued them in some indefinite and life-losing relation to his more powerful organization in England. He did not initiate the separation or the organization in America.

At last the demand from America for autonomy and independent authority was too imperative to be longer resisted, and the Methodist Episcopal Church was formally constituted in 1784, without the manipulation or organizing hand of Mr. Wesley. It is true that Francis Asbury appeared at the Christmas Conference with the authority of a superintendent, having been appointed by Mr. Wesley, but, to evince his loyalty to the American idea, he refused to act under Wesley's appointment, and would not exercise the office of superintendent until elected by the Conference to that office and consecrated in obedience to its superior will. In this historical procedure we discover an independence of Mr. Wesley that almost indicates a severance of relations with him. Wesley did not organize the Methodist Episcopal Church, nor was it organized under his instructions or direction; he did not ordain Asbury, nor was Asbury's election as superintendent due to his appointment, but to the untrammelled choice of the American Conference.

Thus separated from Mr. Wesley, and possessing all the elements of an independent and autonomous Church, American Methodism commenced its history of achievements which have increased with the decades, and which has the promise of the future in its hands. From this point it is easy to trace its development as an independent movement, dependent upon Mr. Wesley for nothing except what it had already received, but

ever maintaining a most fraternal sympathy with him and with the Wesleyanism which was the distinct product of his labors and intentions.

That Mr. Wesley regarded the ecclesiastical unity between Wesleyan and American Methodism broken by the colonial revolution, and that he viewed the Methodist Episcopal Church organized in 1784 as a distinct body independent of his supervision and instruction, are evident from the letter which Dr. Coke bore from him concerning the appointment of Coke and Asbury as superintendents, and which was read to the Christmas Conference prior to the election of Asbury to the superintendency. He says, "As our American brethren are now totally disentangled both from the State and from the English hierarchy, we dare not entangle them again either with the one or the other. They are now at full liberty simply to follow the Scriptures and the primitive Church." The unity that had existed between the two Methodisms was not vital or authoritative, but fraternal and sympathetic; and, as Mr. Wesley was quick to see that his authority could no longer be exercised over an independent Church, he surrendered every claim and left it to the providential guidance of the Head of the Church. At no stage in the early history of American Methodism is the authoritative or original and molding influence of Mr. Wesley discoverable, though his fraternal relation at different periods is most manifest and significant.

Rejecting, therefore, the common view that Mr. Wesley either introduced Methodism to the New World, or was responsible for the organization of the Methodist Episcopal Church, we are prepared, and it is a duty, calmly and justly to consider the exact indebtedness of our Methodism to the distinguished founder of Wesleyanism. To him, as to no other writer, teacher, or preacher, our Methodism is indebted for its system of doctrines, which, essentially Arminian, were so modified as to adapt them to the practical designs of the new movement, and which remain unchanged to this day as the expression of Christian faith on the part of Methodists throughout the world. In teaching doctrine he seems to have been inspired, equally because he resisted open heresy on the one hand and the influence of the prevailing theologies on the other. Neither the intellectual absurdities of Swedenborg, the rationalistic criticisms of Germany, the cold deductions of English deism, the Calvinistic perversions of Whitefield, nor the materialistic trend of philosophy, corrupted his judgment, impaired his vision, beclouded his imagination, or warped his faith in those truths which, rooted in his own experience, stood forth before him as fundamental to religion and revealed in the Holy Scriptures. It came to pass in the progress of his teaching that he announced all the essentials of the Christian system, and proclaimed the most liberal, and at the same time the most rational and the most scriptural, doctrines that it was ever given a human agent to declare. We must also recognize that, while eliminating religious errors from his faith, he was singularly transparent in his statement of the truth that remained, employing no circumlocution, no intricate logical methods, and indulging neither in speculation nor fancy as he dealt with the oracles of God. Whether it was the trinity,

the most mysterious problem of revelation; or the atonement, the central fact of redemption; or Christian perfection, the ideal doctrine of the Church; or eschatology, the cloudy region of religious thought, that occupied his mind or pen, he advanced with bold inquiry, ever respecting the limitations of his intellect, and threw light as light was given him upon all these themes, relieving them of forms, types, imagery, and speculation, and furnished a ground of faith in the whole system. In proof of the integrity of his doctrinal work it is only necessary to point to its unvarying stability. It has stood the test of time, of theology, of philosophy, and of all the varied forms of modern criticism, and is quickening and leavening the doctrinal thought of the world. This, in our judgment, is our greatest indebtedness to John Wesley.

Scaling obligations according to facts, American Methodism gratefully recognizes Mr. Wesley as the source of the institutional life and spirit of the movement which, with its different branches, has spread over all lands and is enriching all peoples. He projected the itinerancy, established the lay ministry, organized the circuit system with its quarterly meeting, introduced the class-meeting, initiated the Sunday-school, and taught the Church the value of the printing-press and the advisability of scattering a wholesome literature among the people. In addition to these fundamental features common to Methodism of whatever name, he formulated our Articles of Religion, gave us wise directions as to the sacraments, and, whenever requested, advised generously and most helpfully on all points of doctrine and discipline. Any underestimate of Mr. Wesley's services to us in any of these departments of church life would be unjust to him and seriously reflect upon our sense of justice, courtesy, and veracity.

Beyond a certain limit, however, we cannot go. The indebtedness is great, but it is not fabulous. Without Mr. Wesley American Methodism had not exactly been: with him, it became what he neither contemplated nor foresaw. It would be extravagant to claim that original Wesleyanism, like the atomic theory of the universe, contained the potency and promise of all its future developments, and that whatever the final issue it may be traceable to the single source of the great leader. Leaning to the accepted view as far as the facts will warrant, fidelity to history and an analysis of our Methodism require the statement that American Methodism had in it an original and independent potency which, with the co-operation of Wesley, insured its future expansion, but which, without his contributing agency, would have developed into a powerful religious movement that might have almost equaled what now passes for Methodism. American Methodism, by virtue of its inherent tendencies and possibilities, and un-Wesleyanized, would have achieved an influential standing as a religion, and triumphed with the rolling years. In respect to our church government, with its episcopacy, itinerancy, presiding eldership, tenure of the pastorate, etc., it is un-Wesleyan, but distinctively American; and when compared with the other we would not think of exchanging it for the Wesleyan system of government. Whatever his suggestions,

our system in its final form is not the fruit of Mr. Wesley's wisdom. In this connection, too, it may well be asked who organized Methodism on the American continent? Who did here even more than Wesley did in England? It is time to prepare a few wreaths for Francis Asbury, to whom, for its organic form and development, American Methodism owes a thousand-fold more than to our Wesleyan teacher. In his *Life and Times of Bishop Elijah Hedding*, Dr. Clark (p. 245) says, "Asbury sustains very much the same relation to American Methodism that Wesley does to the same cause in the British nation." While we do not recommend, it would be appropriate if, at some future period, our Methodism should observe the anniversary of Asbury's death and properly set forth his great labors and achievements in our history. Mr. Wesley gave us doctrine; Mr. Asbury gave us a Church equipped for conflict, and led it through the wilderness, looking as "bright as the sun and terrible as an army with banners." Under the superintendency of Asbury Methodism exhibited the American spirit and took an American form, adapting every possible agency at its command to American conditions and necessities; and the result was an episcopacy, an itinerancy, and a government entirely unlike any thing in the Wesleyan movement.

Finding itself free of English influence, it is not surprising that tendencies to original development should manifest themselves; indeed, they might be expected. Hence, early the principle of lay representation in the Church councils found advocates, and it finally triumphed, first through another body, and then in our own denomination. Lay delegation is in no sense Wesleyan, but purely American. Likewise the larger employment of the sisterhood of the Church in religious work, resulting in woman's missionary societies and an order of deaconesses, is not the fruition of Wesley's hope, but an American idea brought to realization through American means, based upon the necessities of American life. It is not at all questionable, even with the example and teachings of Mr. Wesley before us, that our missionary work and publishing interest have expanded rather according to American instincts and the internal life of our Methodism than according to what he taught or accomplished. Our various benevolent societies, such as the Church Extension, Freedmen's Aid, and the Home Missionary activities, are not due to the inherited spirit of Wesley, but rather to the aggressive spirit of religion and the conquering life of American Methodism. In its present form our Methodism, save in its doctrinal aspects, exhibits few of its early Wesleyan characteristics, and these, as time flies, it is feared will disappear altogether. We must be pardoned if, in this brief study of a single point, we incline to give some credit to Whitefield, who pioneered the English revival across the sea and touched the Atlantic coast with its magnetic power; to Embury, who preached efficiently and independently; to Asbury, who organized the Church; to American Methodism itself, which has in it the divine element of universal propagandism; and to answer the question with which we commenced in the negative.

A REPLY, BUT NOT A REFUTATION.

It is not the purpose of the *Review* to impose upon its readers a superabundance of discussion on the pending question in the Church, nor to continue the unnecessary controversy with *The Christian Advocate* beyond the present number. The parliamentary right to say the last word belongs to the *Review*, it having opened the deliberation, and it now exercises its right. In participating in the discussion it had but a single design, which had been accomplished in the single article it wrote but for the injudicious and ill-considered attempt of that journal to neutralize the recognized influence of that article with the ministry. Owing to its unwarranted extension of the question, so as to include unrelated subjects, we aimed to state with all possible clearness that the question is not ministerial but governmental, and insisted that it should be confined within its legitimate limits. The admission of women into the ministry is not in issue; it is not related to the question in issue; it should, therefore, have no part in the controversy. The next step was to show that the intrinsically governmental question is not a scriptural question, the New Testament referring matters of church government to the discretionary power of the Church itself.

As to the first point, except by controversialists who hope to defeat the governmental measure by loading it down with foreign and unrelated questions, such as the ministry, woman suffrage, and infidelity, it was generally accepted as well taken, and the only position to be taken at the present time. As to the second point, it is allowably debatable, but the *Review* intended merely to place on record its understanding of the New Testament, without attempting to create a party in the Church or afford aid and comfort to the advocates of woman's interest in this controversy. In the exposition of these points, clearly affirmed, we controverted no specific utterances of particular writers, especially avoiding reference to *The Christian Advocate*, and intentionally wrote nothing to invite its antagonism or provoke a word of reply in its columns. With a penchant, however, for attacking every thing not in keeping with its hallucinations and prepossessions, it unwisely assailed, indirectly the first, but chiefly the second point, having discovered that its sandy foundation had been made visible to the world and new work was required at its hands. To this uninvited criticism we returned an answer, repelling its insinuations and sophistries with all the consideration which they required. Brooding over its luckless and ruined argument, it again attempted, in its issue of May 7, to recover lost ground and restore itself to logical soundness; but, with less available material on hand than in the beginning, it completed the wreck of every thing left after the first downfall. Our first article seems to have shaken its position to its foundation; our second seems to have turned its Editor into a polemic with no weapons but words.

Proposing to take care of its position, the *Review* reluctantly but dutifully enters upon the task of exposing the editorial sophistries and ab-

surdities of the recent replication in that paper, pledging the Church that it shall have in this article our final answer to the most inconsiderate, the most incoherent and illogical, the most unfraternal and unethical, and the most unscriptural and un-Methodistic editorial fusillade that has appeared in that quarter since the adjournment of the last General Conference.

PERSONALITIES.

A personality is not entirely under ban in literature. It may sometimes serve an excellent purpose in strengthening an argument or seasoning a pleading, especially if it be humorous, or turning the thought from the argument to the controversialist, and thereby aiding in weakening the effect of his position. Whether to be condemned or approved depends on the motives of the writer or speaker and the aptness or necessity arising from the statements of the opponent. The complaint of the *Advocate* that the *Review* indulged in personal remarks respecting its Editor is very amusing when the facts are considered. It is true we alluded to him in our second article, having been mentioned by him in his first article, and impressed upon him that he should not dispute with a brother Editor unless he was willing to take his chances of a defeat. This should not grieve him or disturb his equanimity. Besides, of all men who have indulged in personalities respecting men and women during the controversy none has been more indiscriminately vituperative than our Christian brother, and that he should shrink with supersensitiveness when others retort in like manner is amazing. Again, the *Review* was dispassionate in its several allusions, but if these made him feel "disparaged," how had he felt had we opened our quiver of sesquipedalian adjectives and hurled them at him with the energy of a battering-ram, as we might have done had we entertained the thought of bruising his sensibilities? Pretending to be fraternal, he attempted to play Ehud with us, claiming to have a message from God in the Scriptures on the pending question, and we contested the claim. Intimating that he is an agile and experienced chasm-leaper, which in certain contingencies might be a virtue, he says he is "disparaged." Exposing his sophistries, he says we attempted to "repair the breaches" in the walls of our position; but we are not sensitive over that reflection. The proof of the solidity of our walls is, that after bombarding them with six columns of absurdities he retires without finding either with microscope or telescope a single indentation in a single stone of the structure. Suggesting that he is "in the wilderness," and that we shall be happy to lead him out, he elegantly writes that he finds us in a "swamp of brambles," but unfortunately he leaves us there, with no promise of help or rescue. He says our rhetoric is heated, and then heats his own rhetoric "seven times more than it was wont to be heated." He charges us with waving the "flag of scholarship" over our exegesis, and then proceeds with no flag of any color over no exegesis of any kind, and seems to think he has said something and refuted all heretical opposition. To end the review, while he is willing to live, if he can serve the present age by further contributions of sophistry, he will prefer the

heavenly world, where women are in the majority and perhaps share in the dominion of its glories, to a home in Methodism if a woman shall occupy a seat next to him in a future General Conference! Has "personality" gone mad?

ASSUMPTION AND SOPHISTRY.

Characterizing the whole reply is a spirit of lofty self-assertion which, when it expresses itself in words, is as reckless of accuracy in statement as it is independent of the commonest rules of logic in reasoning. It assumes that the "consensus of the expositors" of the Scriptures is almost a unit in affirming their sense as it interprets them. We affirm that the consensus of which it speaks is unknown to the *Advocate*, for it has given no proof of any knowledge on the subject; but it assumes the thing in dispute and forces it into the foreground of argument. Consensus proves nothing and is not a particularly helpful influence to an original mind. Nearly all great theological errors have had the support of the consensus of scholars, but they were errors nevertheless. The doctrines of predestination, of apostolical succession, and of papal vicegerency have at one time or another quoted consensus, and with it crushed opponents as if they were heretics. Rationalism and pantheism have claimed consensus, and boasted of temporary success. Even Arianism, Socinianism, and Pelagianism were not without the friendship of many critical scholars, while Unitarianism and Agnosticism are not ashamed of the scholarship that vindicates their tenets. That many scholars are of one mind touching the present issue in Methodism we admit; but the controversialist confesses his inability to maintain his ground by original defense when he depends upon the opinion of some scholars. What is consensus to-day may not be consensus to-morrow. Moreover, as to this question scholars are divided, and it is inexcusable to assume that scholarship is with the assumer.

It assumes that, woman's being promoted to the position of a law-giver, the home will be perverted; the Church will certainly decline, and the New Testament will lose its importance, all of which is artificial sentiment that will not survive the campaign for which it is prepared. Why point to other instances, of which more remain than have been cited?

In close association with these assumptions are the sophistries that constitute the chief material of the replication. In our article we insisted that if the Calvinistic exegesis on church government should be accepted by a Methodist he should accept the conclusion of that exegesis, or the doctrine of a revealed form of government. In answer to this unanswerable logical statement, the *Advocate* says that if we "agree with the Calvinists upon the meaning of the ten commandments we should accept every thing else they hold." We did not say that accepting their exegesis on government we should adopt every thing else they believed, but that we should adopt their conclusions respecting church government. Exegesis on government is joined to exegesis in conclusion. So, accepting Calvinistic exegesis on the ten commandments would require us to accept not "every thing else they hold," but the conclusions in the exegesis. It must also be observed that in the case of the ten com-

mandments they are written and are in permanent form, no dispute arising as to their existence in the Old Testament; but it is in dispute whether church government is a subject of revelation at all, it being a matter of inquiry, speculation, inference. Because the one is given, and the other not given, in concrete form, the exegesis of Calvinists and Methodists agrees as to the ten commandments and differs as to church government. Hence, the two denominations may agree in their conclusions touching the ten commandments and differ, as they do, in their conclusions on church government. Safe to follow the Calvinists in the one case, it would be ruinous to the Methodist theory to follow them in the other. Is this an instance of the "sound reasoning" which the *Advocate* promised to administer to its readers?

CONFUSION AND CONTRADICTION.

Intermixed with sophistries are many confusing and misleading representations, but so patent that it is not difficult to place them on exhibition. The most conspicuous example is the *Advocate's* misuse of our fundamental principle, that the primary ground of woman's eligibility is in her membership in the Church. We had hitherto separated the governmental from the ministerial, or spiritual, department of the Church, showing each to be distinct in character, office, influence, and results from the other. The two are related only so far as they are related to the Church. Membership in the one does not imply a right to membership in the other. The privileges of government arising out of membership belong to all, either representatively or otherwise; but no one enters the ministry except at the call of God. When, therefore, one becomes a member of the Church one has a right to governmental and other privileges, because instituted by the Church; but one has no primary right, based on membership, to the ministry, because not instituted by the Church. Membership does not involve ministerial right, but the ministerial right involves the **lower right** of membership in the Church. No man claims the **right** to enter the ministry because he is a member; no woman, therefore, can claim the right because she is a member. Every human being desiring to obey Christ may enter the Church; but only a particular human being, or a distinct class of persons, may enter the ministry. The one is for all; the other is for a class. Membership, open to all, opens all governmental rights to all; the ministry, not open to all, and based primarily not on membership but on a divine call, is limited to a particular class of individuals. Blind to all these and other differences between the two departments, the *Advocate* contends that our position on membership will admit a woman into the eldership as quickly as into the General Conference. One needs but to study the subject to see that the argument in the one case does not apply at all to the other.

Inasmuch, however, as the *Review* holds that the New Testament confines the ministry to men, the *Advocate* plausibly wonders if the Church must not enact a law in recognition of this limitation, and if such enactment would not bring the ministry within the range of church govern-

ment, and, being brought within the range of law, if the ministry would not become a governmental question? The error of these inferences is as manifest as that of the preceding judgment. Chronologically, the ministry preceded church organization or government, the apostles having been called prior to any church institution or church order. From this fact it is apparent that the ministry organized the government, not the government the ministry; and that, while the ministry was not a governmental question, the government was a ministerial question. The primacy as well as the priority of these departments belongs to the ministry. However, in the historic development of the Church the governing department, by no right, but as a concession on the part of the ministry, enacted laws, first chiefly in recognition of the scriptural instruction on the subject, and second in a larger appropriation of superintending power over the conditions and orders of the ministry. The New Testament status of the ministry, however, remains the same, notwithstanding the subsequent enlargement and exercise of the governmental powers of the Church respecting its functions and duties. Here it is necessary to remember the difference between the New Testament status of the ministry and the exercise of governmental powers on the part of the Methodist Episcopal Church respecting the ministry. We are not discussing the government of the Methodist Episcopal Church, what it enjoins, holds, or conditions touching the ministry, but what the New Testament enjoins and conditions. The remarks of the *Advocate* apply only to our church government, and evade the real point, which is the New Testament idea of the ministry.

It must also be considered that if, because our Church enacts laws or regulations with reference to the ministry, the ministry is properly a "matter of government" it would be rational to conclude that whatever engages the attention of the General Conference, either in the way of resolution, or discussion, or enactment, properly becomes a "matter of government." The theory of the *Advocate* is that an act of a legislative body concerning any subject transforms it into a governmental question, forgetting that a legislative body may transcend its powers in the act of legislation, and that the object of legislation may not be ecclesiastical in any sense whatever. According to its theory, as the last General Conference passed a resolution agreeing to unite in the services on Decoration Day, the latter at once attained the dignity of a church governmental question. If, too, a future General Conference should discuss the navy of the United States, or protest against injustice to the Indians, or sympathize with persecuted Hebrews, the navy, the Indians, and the Hebrews would advance to governmental relations with the Methodist Episcopal Church. A false method of reasoning, when applied to other questions than the intended one, soon exhibits its own absurdity.

We grieve over the necessity of a still further notice of the contradictory character of this wonderful editorial deliverance. More than once it assures us that "consensus" is against us, and that we stand alone; but unfortunately when it undertakes to display its skill in the manu-

facture of a word, or borrows one because in distress, it announces that a "host" is with us. "Eisegesis," it says, "is to put in a sense" in the Scriptures; "and this discussion has developed a host of practical *Eisegetes*, with the *Review* in the vanguard." To reconcile "consensus" against us with a "host" with us is not our business; we refer it to whom it may concern. Besides, it is noticeable that the *Eisegetes* following the *Review* are "practical." They are not an ill-balanced, radical, sentimental, or revolutionary class, but men of common sense, of broad practical scholarship, searchers of truth in a logical way, and eager to plan for the triumph of the kingdom of God. A host of such *Eisegetes*, with the *Review* in the vanguard, is in contrast with the Editor of the *Review* "isolated from the whole Christian world." This is another instance of the "sound reasoning" on which the *Advocate* prides itself.

Again, if "eisegesis" means "to put in a sense," the *Advocate* is *eisegetical*, for it is "loading down" the New Testament with foreign ideas, while if "exegesis" means "to draw out the sense," it would seem that the *Review* is exegetical, and therefore on Scriptural grounds. The word *eisegesis*, like an old Spanish gun, recoils in the use and blows the user to atoms.

Our amazement, growing with every paragraph in the reply, reaches its climax in the humiliating exposure that now must be made. The *Review* said: "In his issue of March 12 he confesses that he is opposing the present movement because of that to which he thinks it will lead, implying that perhaps in itself it is all proper enough, but as it will lead to something else it is improper." To this statement the *Advocate* replies: "Our readers know that this is a misrepresentation. No such admission can be found in *The Christian Advocate*, and no such implication." Turning to the *Advocate* of March 12, in an editorial on "It Means Women as Traveling Preachers," we read: "When we stated in October last that these two movements [admission of women into the General Conference and the ministry] are inseparably connected, the cry was raised that we were trying to break the pending measure down by loading it with the other. We were and *are trying to defeat the project for the admission of women by showing to what it will certainly lead* [*italics ours*], and for what some are avowedly advocating it." First, it is clear that the *Advocate* foresaw success of the pending measure unless it was loaded down with something still more objectionable; second, that its method of argumentation was to oppose the more objectionable possibility in order to overcome the powerful movement for the governmental rights of women. In passing, it is proper to observe that such a method of argumentation is unknown in the New Testament, neither our Lord nor his apostles loading down an error with other things unrelated to it in order to defeat it, nor is such method countenanced in logic, in ethics, or in religion. Had the *Advocate* confined its opposition to the issue it had been driven from the field months ago; but it has resorted to the "loading down" method, even dragging in "woman suffrage" as a probable result, as its only hope of escape from a complete and deserved failure. Finding that it is not amenable to the laws of thought, the principles of logic, or the limita-

tions of controversy, it is useless to continue discussion with it on this subject. Finally, what shall be said of the denial that "such admission" and "such implication," as the extract of March 12 fully justifies, can be found in *The Christian Advocate*? The denial is not sophistry, else it would be condoned. After this exhibition of self-impeachment in print, we cannot "disparage" the writer; he has "disparaged" himself beyond repair.

THE COLLAPSE OF THE ARGUMENT.

Personality, assumption, sophistry, confusion, and contradiction combine in the renewed effort of the *Advocate* to strengthen an argument that refuted itself when first framed. The *Review*, in its first article, declared the Methodist position on church government, to which the *Advocate* assented, but it undertook to reduce the effect of its admission by sophistically adding that certain principles of legislation or administration were revealed in the word of God. In its first article it had the splendid opportunity of announcing these biblical principles, but it named none. Knowing that its statement could not be sustained, the *Review* named certain fundamental principles that would properly have entered into the constitution, organization, and subsequent legislation of the primitive Church, especially if the apostles had intended to transmit principles at all to the Church of the future, and examined the New Testament to find them, but the examination revealed an absence of these as well as other fundamental principles. Driven in desperation to vindicate its statement, the *Advocate*, in its second article, ventures upon the perilous task, with a result that has excited the laughter of scholars, the reprobation of logicians, and the grievous regrets of its friends.

Its readers had a right to expect that fundamental principles would be stated with such clearness, and based on such scriptural proofs, as to dissipate the suspicion that its statement was, as usual, sophistical and incorrect. What great principle, therefore, of church government is discovered by the *Advocate* in the New Testament? Among the "many" it claims to exist, it "promptly" decides upon one, which presumably is the best and strongest proof of its position, and rushes into the arena with it. What is it? In Matt. xviii, 15-17, Jesus orders three steps to be taken prior to the trial of a brother for a trespass against another. It would seem to legal minds that a trial is more important than the preliminary steps to it, especially if they are chiefly social and moral, and are not in themselves legal—that is, that a trial can only be conducted on legal principles, while the preliminary steps may not be legal at all. It is remarkable that Jesus leaves no instructions concerning the trial—that is, he leaves no legal principles as guides for the future. All that he does is (a) to require a conference between the parties; this is social duty; (b) if the conference fail, then renew it with one or two present; it is still a social or moral duty; (c) if the second conference fail, inform the Church, and if the accused be obstinate and will not hear the Church, then let him be as a heathen and a publican. "Hear the Church" is a phrase implying trial, but no instruction is given as to how the Church should conduct it. Who says that

these advisory, cautionary, preliminary, social attempts at the settlement of a difficulty involve great legal principles? Not Jesus, but the *Advocate*! After citing this example of a "principle," it had been appropriate to submit it to an "infant-class," but not to others, for a school-boy would have tossed it out of the window, and an adult would have repudiated it as the mockery of law and ethics. Was ever collapse more complete? Why did it not quote the passage that legally prohibits women from a share in the rulership in the Church?

If, then, we may conclude there are no fundamental principles of legislation in the New Testament, the *Advocate* utterly failing to produce one, of what use is, or what place has, the New Testament in legislation? Its relation to legislation is most intimate—so intimate that legislation contrary to it must be rejected. But what is the point of contact? The New Testament is a book of principles or teachings, sociological, ethical, religious, ministerial, and legal, but not a book of *governmental* principles or teachings. Legislation must harmonize with its sociology, its ethics, its religion, its ministerial spirit, its law, but not with any alleged but non-existent governmental idea or with any legal fiction read into the New Testament. Even the decalogue was not instituted for the government of the Church, but for the individual, and church legislation must harmonize with it. But biblical law for all men is very different from biblical principles of legislation laid down explicitly for the Church in its governmental life. Of such principles not *one* has been named. Our statement assists in understanding the phrase in Article XXII. that as to rites and ceremonies nothing shall be ordained against God's word—that is, against the teachings herein given. This also corrects the assumption of the *Advocate*, that the Article implies that Methodism recognizes governmental or legislative principles in the New Testament, whereas it recognizes other principles none of which prohibits or is incompatible with woman's rulership, and harmonizes with them. It also cancels its inference that the *Review*, because it affirmed the absence of church form in the Scriptures, seemed to conclude that they "have nothing to do with church government." Thus the argument of that paper takes another collapse and we have another instance of "sound reasoning!"

Not less visionary and delusive are the observations of the *Advocate* on our exegesis of 1 Tim. ii, 11, 12. It accuses us of original exegetical scholarship; we cannot bring such a "railing accusation" against it. The *Review* undertakes to do its own thinking, but the *Advocate*, for an evident reason, resorts to "consensus."

The only original attempt over the *Epistle* at all consists of two blunders that are most unmistakable and inexcusable. It tortures the *Advocate* to be told that there is nothing in the chapter on government, as if the fact should not have weight; it says, "The question is, What is the subject and purpose of the *Epistle*?" In several epistles, as in those to the Corinthians and Thessalonians, and in that of 2 Peter, there are several subjects under discussion, so that one may not determine the value of a teaching on a particular subject by a reference to the general design of the

whole. In this case we answer the *Advocate* by commencing with the opening chapter of Paul's First Epistle to Timothy, in which his purpose is not obscurely set forth. In i, 3, Paul says: "As I besought thee to abide still at Ephesus, when I went into Macedonia, that thou mightest charge some that they teach no other doctrine." After describing certain things to be condemned he says, verse 10, "And if there be any other thing that is contrary to sound doctrine," etc. Later in the chapter Paul alludes to his own ministry. From these passages it is evident that the apostle is instructing Timothy in his duties as a minister, requiring the preaching of sound doctrine. What becomes of the assertion of the *Advocate* that "all the exegetes hold that the first part of it [the Epistle] relates to the public worship of Almighty God?" In the second chapter Paul, having passed from the ministry, instructs as to prayer for kings and rulers, and then advises as to the attire of women and their relation to husbands and the family.

As yet nothing has appeared on church government. The second blunder of the *Advocate* is that it says, "The very array of women there mentioned relates to their appearance in public in connection with the worship of God." Not a woman is mentioned in the first chapter, and none by name in the second; where is the array of women? Each succeeding chapter is on a special topic or more than one, the Epistle being as miscellaneous in character as any that Paul wrote, unless we conclude that it was intended to instruct a minister in his duties and relations. It does not, therefore, relate primarily to the "worship of Almighty God," as the *Advocate* alleges, and is barren of all allusion to church government.

If the *Advocate* or "all the exegetes" ever read this Epistle it is not manifest in the observations of our *confrère*. Without any exegesis of its own, and blundering in every statement it has made respecting the Epistle, it is only just to say that its argument has taken a third and final relapse into a collapse of death.

And here the case may rest, with the observation respecting the *Advocate's* *exegetical* treatment of the Scriptures that if it be possible to commit a trespass against them by adding to them or infiltrating their teachings and perverting their spirit it is perilously near a condition of open and premeditated guilt. Under a special hallucination in its warfare against woman's eligibility it has flagrantly, speciously, and persistently speculated with the divine teachings as if it had a monopoly of intelligence concerning their meaning, and attempted to impose its vagaries upon the Church. The affirmative party in the Church, holding that the New Testament presents no barrier to woman's joint rulership with man in ecclesiastical affairs, repudiates its sophisms and general guidance.

If in this analysis of the replication, proving that it is not a refutation of the position of the *Review*, we have dealt firmly and transparently with its errors it was because it was necessary to teach a lesson where it is needed, and we close with expressing the hope that in its future discussions on this subject the *Advocate* will conform to the principles of jurisprudence, "sound reasoning," and the scriptural revelations.

PROGRESS OF CIVILIZATION.

CHARACTER must be the sole standard of human measurement in the ideal civilization. Such a basis of valuation as physical force, powers of leadership, learning, riches, or brute courage in battle, by which men have so commonly been judged, are fallacious methods of estimate. Men, in the highest signification of the term, are immeasurably more than acrobats, politicians, book-worms, or warriors. Even the ancient races have felt the worth of a different standard of judgment, in their praise of virtue and their apotheosis of the good. As righteousness is the supreme test in the divine measurement, so that civilization will be the ultimate which unhesitatingly and absolutely adopts a like basis of estimate. It will be said that the times are especially difficult for character-building. By many considerations the claim seems well taken. Though every age has had its specific temptations, and though it has been ordained that humanity shall always come through furnace fires to its purification, yet the allurements to the materialistic and sensuous life seem at this juncture particularly forcible. The labor of moralists, the diverse activities of the Church, and all the combined forces of righteousness seem pitifully weak in comparison with the agencies of evil that are in the field to subvert high manhood. The all-forcible influence of example is particularly operative. A thousand illustrations of evil greet the on-coming generation and weaken its allegiance to the right. Lesser defalcations or extensive embezzlements of trust-funds, by men whose reputes have hitherto been unstained, are an almost daily announcement. The dissipations of the gambling-table and the race-course absorb the interests of some of the flower of humanity. The world reeks with immoralities, and even in our most Christian land persistent whisperings of covert sensuality are heard. Murder, also, on which God has put his severest anathema, is reckoned by some a legitimate method of revenge, and is practiced by them as a pleasant pastime. It is not a morbid view of life that cites these existent evils. But fidelity to our chosen subject demands their specification. A dispassionate study of the question, however, justifies the inference that the world is steadily growing into an appreciation of the superlative worth of virtue. Not alone has Christianity reiterated the teaching from the spiritual stand-point, and shown goodness to be the doorway of entrance into the heavenly kingdom, but the conviction of the present and mundane value of virtue, as an essential to national perpetuity and influence, seems on the increase. Even among the heathen nations of the world, so monstrous in their grossness, there is discoverable on the part of the meditative that condemnation of superstitious and debasing national orgies, and that admiration for the right, which a contemplation of virtue always awakens. In France, the land of sensuousness, many cry out for better things. In England the sentiment of disdain will be discovered for family escutcheons as an open sesame to indolence and waste of life. In Amer-

ica, where sometimes the observer looks out with foreboding, Christian optimism forces the belief in the growth of virtue. If there be fluctuations in moral practice, yet the trend cannot be permanently wrong. The pendulum swings hopefully toward the right. Even on the lower consideration of national preservation, such prime questions as Sabbath observance, the liquor traffic, and the spoils system must have their solution in restriction, in heartfelt detestation of their evil effects, and in the earnest pursuit of excellence. Somewhere in God's world—it may be upon the American shores—virtue is to have its highest development. Character will be supreme. It has adorned, like a jewel, every age. It is the granitic foundation on which the final civilization shall erect its lasting structure.

WHAT shall be said of the migratory impulse of modern life? Be the causes of this disposition what they may, the restlessness of the age is one of its conspicuous traits. Evidential of this unrest is the infrequency of the ownership of homes. It would be an important result to accomplish through the census-taker—and such has indirectly been one of the late matters of information sought by the government—if there were ascertained what proportion of the American nation are owners of their dwellings and what proportion are rent-payers. A considerable percentage of our total population, it will be safe to venture, are tenants. They dwell, as did Paul, in their "own hired house," and for reasons which seem to them sufficient are particularly frequent in their itinerations. Whatever the advantages of such a lack of ownership in homes, these are certainly more than offset by evidently mischievous consequences. The joy of proprietorship in a little hand-breadth of ground spread along God's great world and of title in a fireside roof is permanently unknown. The gratification of one of the legitimate desires of the nature goes unrealized, and men in a special sense become "pilgrims and strangers on the earth." Nor is such a nation of migrants usually the best equipped for war. It is more than a poetic thought that hearth-stones are the incentive to the hard tests of soldiery and the inspiration to wounds or death. As a rule, they fight best who fight for the home. But we need not at this time inquire as to the willingness on the part of so many to endure the pains of homelessness. Whether the expense of living prevents personal ownership, whether an undue selling-price is in many instances put upon real estate, or whether there is an inherited disposition on the part of many to shrink from the responsibilities of possession and to rejoice in the nomadic life, it is not necessary to decide. Sufficient is it for the present purpose to point out this disposition to tenancy and to lift a warning voice against its increase. But we may remind ourselves besides of the flight of the multitudes countryward, when the summer culminates, as another proof of this migratory spirit. The great hegira has begun. In visits to the sea-shore, in exodus to the mountains, in tours to the Continent, the procession is on the move. Nor are all the motives of this annual peripateticism difficult of discovery. It is probable that a larger proportion of

invalids travel now than in former years. The conveniences of locomotion are so great as to rid the journey of much of its tedium; and the advertisement of newly tried fountains of health on either continent is so frequent and illusive as to prompt the sufferer to renewed search for recovery. Besides, the cheapness of transportation has undoubtedly inspired a wish for change and for sight-seeing on the part of the multitudes to whom otherwise travel would be an unrealized dream. Cut-rates and tourists' excursions are responsible for some proportion of the multitudes that in the summer solstice carry the pilgrim's wallet and oftentimes learn the beneficial lesson of the largeness of the globe and the largeness of mortal life. But less commendable than such a motive for travel is the imitative spirit in which so many of the nation go up and down the world. Fashion imposes the obligation; and under its miserable mandate the aristocratic flit from mountain to spa as idly as summer midges among the flowers. These and other phases of individual or national itineration are clearly apparent. Like one who watches the flight of migratory birds we may stand apart from human life and moralize upon its passing.

THE NEWSPAPER is a prominent instance of modern enterprise. Its activity is constant and its field of operations unbounded. In the form of the daily print it enriches the reader with its ample budget of information from many lands. As an illustrated weekly it sketches in indelible outlines the battle-fields of the nations, new edifices erected for commercial or residential purposes, the faces of the great, the tragedies or the comedies of life. In the guise of the great religious weeklies it records the fruits of Christian activity in home and in heathen fields. Whatever its form, it is a rare illustration, in the closing decade of the century, of the omnivorous spirit of inquiry and enrollment that marks the age. Its eyes are upon all lands, and its deft types are quick in the registration of noteworthy events around the whole globe. So familiar are all these features of modern journalism that to discuss the industry or the achievements of the press would be altogether a work of supererogation. Nor may we wonder at the wide influence of such an ever-present and constantly operative force in modern civilization. The newspaper is regnant in its power. As an agent in the political field, opposing parties have long since learned to fear its enmity, and have made haste to subsidize its columns as an assistant into office. Constantly are candidates chosen or rejected by its sovereign voice. As an aid in social reforms that intermittingly agitate a community, the power of the press has more than once been manifested, to the rejoicing of the better disposed and in the extermination of local evils. As a helper in the majestic work of evangelism, the public print has hitherto been an auxiliary whose zealous support might well be coveted, and whose giant blows have been mightily efficacious in the overthrow of evil. The expectation is therefore justified by past experience that the daily and weekly journal, if sincerely consecrated to the best interests of men, must still prove an

unlimited blessing to the age. In its perpetual aid, among many agencies, is to be found hope for the suppression of gambling, the extermination of saloons and opium-joints, and the restraint of all the forms of turbulence and salaciousness that mark the times. As a terror to those that do amiss, all baser criminals and all betrayers of the public trust must continue to fear with untold dread the light that it has power to throw upon their nefarious schemes. We may rejoice in these possibilities of the press as an ally of the right, and confidently hope for it even larger effectiveness in the emergencies of the future.

Yet we cannot be oblivious of the evils that attach to the secular journalism of the day. Some of its errors of conduct are unmistakable. In the necessary rapidity with which news is gathered, accuracy of statement is sometimes sacrificed to the demands of promptness. With disregard for the sanctity of the Lord's day, and against the protests of a weighty part of the community, the "Sunday edition" has become a settled feature of most of our great dailies. In unconcern for the finer sense of virtue that should be consulted, there is a class of publications that join themselves with the pleasure-loving, the base, and even the law-defying elements of the land. Too many of our daily prints abound with lecherous and prurient items which conscienceless news-gatherers have collected; and in cheapness of cost are these put within the reach of the young and inexperienced upon the stand of the dealer. In the spirit of relative indifference also to individual interests, as compared with the incessant demand for novelties, oftentimes the minute details of private life are unfolded. With cold inquisitiveness the reporter enters into the sanctities of the home and drags into prominence matters that should never be disclosed. The little that is true is too often enriched by much that is imaginary; neither age, nor sex, nor former repute is regarded; hitherto stainless characters are wickedly maligned; and the dagger is sent to the heart of the quivering victim in the falsehoods that are scattered broadcast by the insensate types. Such a wanton play with hard-earned and valuable reputation cannot be too indignantly rebuked. The time has come to call a halt. De Malesherbes, it is recorded, was appointed "censor of the press" in the reign of Louis XV. The revival of this defunct office is not desirable in this later day and among the environments of republicanism; yet the stringent enforcement of existing laws regulating reportorial conduct would not be amiss. The journalist of the day is not a creature of bohemian impulses who is altogether irresponsible. Human laws, which should be much more severe, hedge him about. In addition, also, to the unsatisfactory amends that the civil courts may force him to make, he is amenable to the higher courts of divine justice in obligation that is constant and illimitable. In no spirit of undue hostility do we catalogue and deplore these defects of the present journalistic system; but with a broad recognition of its excellencies and possibilities do we weigh this modern agency in the balances of impartial judgment. For a purified and rightly conducted secular press the doors of unlimited opportunity open.

THE ARENA.**MISSION AMONG THE WYANDOTS.**

HISTORY does not justify the assertion often made among us, that John Stewart was the first Protestant missionary among the Wyandot Indians.

In the year 1800 the Connecticut Missionary Society appointed Rev. Joseph Badger—a native of Wilbraham, Mass., born in 1757, a graduate of Yale College, and a pastor of fourteen years' experience—a missionary to the Western Reserve, O., the first clergyman who labored in that field. He reached his new field of labor and commenced his work at Youngstown on the last Sabbath of the year. During the year 1801 he visited the scattered settlements on the Reserve east of Cleveland, preaching and encouraging the people "with hopes of a brighter day," and that "in a few years churches will [would] be erected and ministers breaking the bread of life in them."

During the same year he made a trip to Brownstown, Mich., to visit the celebrated Captain Bluejacket, a Shawnee chief, in company with a son of the chief, at whose request the journey was undertaken, and was most cordially entertained. On the journey up he spent a Sabbath at a village of Delaware Indians on the Huron River, and held religious service, and on his return, though weak from an attack of ague and fever, preached to the Indians at Lower Sandusky on Sabbath, October 6. The Sabbath previous, though at the same place, he was too ill to preach. While detained here he had "a talk with the chiefs on the subject of having a minister live with them and teach their children to read," etc. They were Wyandots. On returning to the Reserve he resumed his labors, and on October 24 organized the church at Austinburg—the first on the Reserve—"consisting of ten male and six female members."

In 1802 he removed his family (wife and six children) from the East and built a cabin at Austinburg to serve as a home for them. He continued his labors among the pioneers on the Reserve, preaching, organizing churches, and administering the sacraments amid the privations and sacrifices incident to pioneer life.

In 1805 he spent over two months among the Indians (Wyandots) preaching to them at Upper Sandusky, Lower Sandusky, Brownstown, and Maguago, impressing upon them the importance of an evangelical Christian civilization, and serving their best interests in various other ways. During this visit he secured their confidence and gained a commanding influence over them, thus preparing the way for the establishment of a mission among them.

Shortly after this Mr. Badger severed his connection with the Connecticut Society in consequence of inadequate support, and by the Western Missionary Society was appointed missionary to the Wyandots. He commenced his labors among them early in 1806, ten years and about six months before John Stewart visited them.

He located at the Indian village a little above Lower Sandusky, built him a house, and began preparations for a school, which was commenced the next year with flattering prospects. He continued preaching to the Indians at their several villages, visiting among them, encouraging and assisting them in agricultural pursuits, urging upon them temperance and sobriety, and the importance of a religious life.

He visited Governor Hull at Detroit, twice at least, in the interest of the Indians, once in 1805 and again in 1806. "His Excellency," he writes, "said every thing necessary to express his full approbation of the missionary enterprise. He also gave a number of farming utensils for the use of the mission."

These labors were continued amid privations and sacrifices that would have disheartened a less energetic and devoted man until September, 1808, when the mission was visited by a committee of the Board from Pittsburg.

The mission was examined as to its methods, its success, and its prospects. The prospects were so encouraging, and the demand for additional means so great, that it was decided that Mr. Badger should visit New England and solicit contributions. He went, and secured over \$1,000 for this enterprise.

Returning, he resumed his labors among the Indians, and continued until late in the fall of 1809, when he received intelligence from his wife at Austinburg, whither he had removed his family on account of their sickness at the mission, that their house was burned, with nearly all their furniture and clothing. This sad event rendered it necessary for him to leave the mission and attend to the wants of his destitute family.

Whether the work among the Indians was committed to other hands does not appear from his Memoir, published at Hudson, O., in 1851.

The remaining years of Mr. Badger's active ministry were spent on the Reserve. In 1835 he removed to Wood County, O., where he spent his declining years with some of his children and grandchildren. He died at Perrysburg in 1846, aged eighty-nine years.

WM. C. PEIRCE.

Berea, Ohio.

THE AGRICULTURAL DEPRESSION.

As evidenced by the swift and remarkable growth of the spirit of organization among farmers there is wide-spread and deep unrest over the continued low prices of all farm products. Among the causes of this depression are the following, which constitute, we think, a cumulative argument worthy the most serious thought of the wisest statesmanship:

1. An indisposition to mixed farming and the day of small things, consequent on the change of conditions brought about by increase of population and competition.
2. Lack of economy of time. There was a golden day when the countryman could be busy from spring till fall, and practically hibernate

through the winter and live in splendid shape. When the majority of the agricultural class shall have learned the value of time, as have the inhabitants of cities, there will be a change for the better.

3. The giving way of the virgin soil of the country. We are now in a transition from the touch of a soil that has been giving its products, Midas-like, to the conditions of tillering that have attained in England and on the Continent for centuries.

4. Transportation combines have been against the farmer. A case in hand is the great evener combination of 1873, by which the Pennsylvania Central, the New York Central, and Erie railroads charged \$115 freight for each car-load of stock from Chicago to New York, and gave a rebate of \$15 on each car to certain Chicago shippers, which had the effect of centering the cattle market of the country in Chicago, and of breaking down all competing points and traders. The whole profit of the gigantic scheme was paid by the cattle interest. So with much other work of this kind not yet uncovered.

5. Consolidation of packing establishments, forcing the farmer to take his stock to the great cities, where he is usually at the mercy of the buyer, for in all the great markets there is concerted action of buyers against sellers.

6. Stock-yard expenses, frequently exorbitant, and from which there is no escape.

7. Board of Trade influences, making it possible to corner the market and deal in options.

8. A mistaken incidental policy in the text-books of the public-schools, which we think, on the whole, has given our children a magnified view of the importance of city life as compared with the country, which has had the effect to draw on the country region for its wealth of character.

9. The comparative overgrowth of cities, made so in part by a natural tendency, like that which has made villagers of most European peoples—the desire to live in closer social relations than the isolation of the country affords.

10. Capitalistic and machine-farming, which crowds the small farmer in the same way that the small trader is crowded in the city.

11. The adulteration of intelligence as to the supplies of grain and stock. This can be done by either the suppression or manufacture of intelligence, not only as to products, but as to markets and prices. This is always to the detriment of the farmer.

12. The increase of taxation on land. Land "lies out of doors." It can be seen and cannot get away. It is the easiest thing from which tax can be collected, and the constant tendency is toward laying a heavier burden on it.

13. Legislation in America lately now has been overwhelmingly in the direction and for the protection and building of manufacturing interests, under the belief that farmers were a self-contained class, and would live and grow fat through all possible commercial commotions.

14. Agriculturalists have been slow to organize, and they have been put into the squeeze. The highest economic interest of the individual of any class now is in the fact that he belongs to the combine—ethical considerations do not change the facts. The American farmer must get into the swim, and stay there, or be left high and dry on the shore to sunburn and rot.

W. R. HALSTEAD.

Bloomington, Ind.

WHOM HE DID FOREKNOW.

In his excellent article on Romans, in the March-April number of the *Review*, Doctor Williams, touching upon the questions of foreknowledge and foreordination, says:

God by his foreknowledge either foreknew the exact future character and outcome of all men, and not of the elect only, or, which is the fact, he foreknew the exact future of none. This future—the future of free agents—the future of all free agents, he remitted, under the provisions of his plan, to each one's own personal, independent, *unforeseen* choice.

This is the doctrine of divine nescience so carefully elaborated by Dr. McCabe. A little farther on he says:

The Infinite One, from the first, looked out upon all the coming race with the same fatherly, loving solicitude. And this, *just this*, is what the apostle means by the word *foreknew*. He would tell us that in the divine planning "God had ALL men in his thought from the start."

Can such a doctrine of foreknowledge be held consistently with the doctrine of nescience so boldly posited in the language of the first quotation? Without believing in Traducianism is it not true that the creation of every human soul since Adam and Eve has depended for its occasion at least upon human co-operation, and hence upon human volition? For we are under no stern necessity of propagating our kind.

If this be true, and if it be true as well that future human volitions are unknown to God, then in what sense can it be said that the "Infinite One from the first looked out upon all the coming race?" or that "God had all men in his thought from the start?" In other words, does not the doctrine of divine nescience concerning future human volitions carry with it the doctrine of divine nescience concerning future individual human existence?

F. C. BALDWIN.

Newark, N. J.

COMMENDATION IN LIFE, OR FLORAL TRIBUTES IN DEATH.

Good men are not a unit upon the question mooted. Some are as silent as an Egyptian mummy to a man's merits while living, but when he is dead, and hears not, then their words come as a rushing avalanche of unbounded eulogies. They appear to think they are doing the deceased man great good in the glowing words.

In a late Conference the question of indorsing a brother's action was broached, and the question was asked, "Shall we commend him in life,

or cover his coffin with floral offerings when dead?" The question was discussed *pro* and *con*, with views as different as the colors of the rainbow. One earnest brother said he "would rather have one small tuberosity of commendation in life than to have his coffin covered with the most gorgeous floral wreaths when dead." Was he, or was he not, wise? I suppose the brother's thought was, that if he knew while alive that he was pleasing his brethren he would be encouraged and strengthened to do much more in the future. If he did not know, he would become discouraged and weakened in all future efforts to do or dare in the war for the right. Some argue that if a man be praised for his works he becomes proud and puffed up. A bad man would, but a good man would not. If the pompous pride is in the man's heart, just as well let it out and be done with it at once, for it would come out at some time and in some way. Commendation is natural and almost universal, except, it may be, among the people and ministers in some places.

The doctor is commended by the patient, and is told, "I feel so grateful to you, doctor, for saving my life, the life of my husband, babe, son, or daughter," as the case may be. Does that make the doctor vain and puffed up, and less likely to do his best in the future? The blacksmith shoes your horse well, and you tell him so. Do you fear that he will become so inflated with praise that in the future he will do you bad service? The housemaid makes your bread to your liking, and you tell her so. Will she fail to please you in her future efforts, as a result of your commendation? Who is so foolish as to think so? To withhold the word of appreciation in such cases is usually regarded as a proof of ingratitude, and that the kindly act performed is estimated by the recipient at a commercial standard. No one, however small his service to others, is above the influence that an appreciative word can kindle. It has more power than money, and excites a moral benefit that sometimes effects great changes in the life. The rule of common life, in all its departments and activities, requires the recognition of the kindly deeds of others in words of gratitude and reciprocal fellowship; without this rule life would be barren, philanthropy would lose its energy, and labor its inspiration.

Is not this practice almost universal, and does it not help all mortals to do better? Why, then, make the minister the exception of all the mortal race? Must he be kept humble by letting him go along in the dark, fearing that his efforts are unacceptable and imperfect? Honest commendation will do a good man great service. If a bad and improper man, he will only be inflated and explode the sooner.

St. Louis, Mo.

T. H. HAGERTY.

OXFORD OR UNIVERSITY CHAPTERS OF THE EPWORTH LEAGUE.

THE Epworth League has already become a vigorous institution of our Church. It has entered more than five thousand charges and set our young men and women to work with a zeal and interest unprecedented.

42—FIFTH SERIES, VOL. VII.

It has directed their activity into many channels of Christian usefulness. It has interested in the Church many thousands who had not before been brought even to the church portal. It bids fair to become one of the most effective instruments of the Church for the culture and discipline of its hosts, and for its aggressive movements in the extension of the Master's kingdom. Its work has just begun.

I have in this article to suggest a field for its activity almost untouched. All over this country, in the many State and undenominational colleges and universities and in those of denominational institutions, there are young men and women from homes connected with our Church. They have good reasons for preferring the halls of some other college than those of their own Church. Prudential reasons, social reasons, reasons springing from locality, have led them in their choice.

It is often the fact that in these communities our local Church is weak in comparison with that of the denomination founding or chiefly influential in the management of the college where our young Methodists are for the time resident. This fact has its natural effect upon growing and impressible minds, and the result is a lessening of that interest in the Church of the father and mother which would not have taken place if its work and character had been efficiently represented in the community. To meet this need, and keep before these cultivated young men and women the ideals and activities for which Methodism stands, it seems to me the Church as a whole should undertake to do what the local charge may be unable to do. How can it do this better at present than by organizing, wherever practicable, Oxford chapters of the Epworth League?

The name Oxford is full of interest to every university student, and is alive with associations that can but stimulate a young Methodist collegian if properly brought home to him. For this purpose a different local constitution is needed from that in use in the ordinary pastoral charges, as the conditions differ decidedly. For this work special literature should be prepared.

The Church as a whole can do its future great service by making a study of these non-Methodist university centers, and planning to have itself ably represented in these important and strategic points.

I hope this putting of an idea for which I am indebted to the words and acts of others as well as to my own reflections may help on such a movement.

WILLIAM INGRAHAM HAVEN.

Boston, Mass.

[We indorse the suggestion of the above article. Notwithstanding our colleges are numerous, and the patronage is large, it is inevitable that many of our youth will drift into institutions under the control of the State or other denominations. The organization of Oxford chapters of the Epworth League in such institutions, or in connection with the local Church in such communities, would conduce to results that need not be named, but which may be easily anticipated.—EDITOR.]

THE ITINERANTS' CLUB.

THE SAVING INSTINCT.

WE have in mind not the saving of money, but of sermonic materials. This instinct will lead the preacher to place no small value on every sort of information. If he is ever tempted to say of something which only slightly strikes his fancy, "This does not please me much, and I do not see where or how I can use it, I will let it pass or throw it away," his saving instinct will earnestly and instantly plead for its preservation; and, as a rule, he will do well to heed the promptings of that instinct. Doubtless this accumulative instinct, if cultivated, will lead on to the conviction that every kind of knowledge, even the odds and ends, the merest shreds of information, will come in play some time or other. There is a suggestive saying which reads thus: "It is an evidence of blindness when a man can see nothing unless it glitters." The preacher should be like the experienced gold-digger, who takes the smallest nuggets, and is not fool enough to throw them away because he hopes anon to find lumps of larger size. Or he should be like the skillful gardener, who saves "every slip and seed and peach-stone." "The sage rejects nothing," says Lao Tze. "I go to the woods after game," says a writer of distinction, "but if the game is not there I get nuts; if there are no nuts I gather flowers or leaves; if these fail I get woodcraft of some sort, or, by grace of Heaven, a thought. I will not be of those who find that the road is only good to leave behind them." There is, too, a household maxim which is illustrative of this thought; it reads, "Keep a thing three years and you will find a use for it." Daniel Webster once wove into a speech an exceedingly apt anecdote. When asked, "Where did you get that story?" he replied, "I have had it laid up in my head for fourteen years, and never had a good opportunity to use it until to-day."

Samuel Butler has put much of thought, many precepts, similitudes, allusions, inferences, and the like, into his *Hudibras*; but this collection originally was made in a commonplace book which was years in compiling. The facts out of which Guizot compiled his *Spanish History* were gathered from various sources, and twenty years intervened from the time his first notes were made to the date of its publication. Some of the best productions of Emerson were similarly composed. It may be said that no one can estimate of how great value, some day, will be the accumulations for which at the outset there seems to be no use. The best sermons of our best preachers are full of suggestive and helpful thoughts, and are growths, not flashes, of original inspiration.

The outfit needed by the preacher when following his saving instinct is inexpensive, and consists of a pen or pencil to mark with, scissors or a knife to cut with, and boxes or pigeon-holes to stow things away in.

In order to make his stores available he is to look them over often, and use them as soon as that can be done to advantage.

THE ANNUAL VACATION.

NOT many years ago the vacation among Methodist preachers was unknown. Now it is thought of and provided for in, perhaps, the majority of our parishes. More and more are our preachers availing themselves of the benefits of traveling during the vacation season. Many of the advantages of a vacation, when an out-and-out vacation is denied, may be secured in an exchange of pulpits by preachers living in places distant from one another. Such an arrangement enables even those of limited means to visit localities otherwise denied them. In this matter of seeing the world the itinerancy, when not circumscribed by Conferences or States, as it should not be, though it now practically is so in its ordinary workings, affords the Methodist ministry peculiar advantages. The active men are in what is called the *traveling* relation, and theoretically the range of appointments is world-wide.

When the preacher is enabled to visit places of interest in our own land, which should be done before going abroad, or when the "tour abroad" is made possible, he will gain, if he has the sermon-habit, much information which can be used in his sermon-building. But let him be modest. People are sick of the "*When I was in Europe*." Our Lord's method is wise and suggestive. He did not say, "As I was passing a field I saw one of your countrymen sowing his seed," which doubtless was true, but he said, "Behold, a sower went forth to sow." In a public prayer a preacher who had just returned from a brief trip abroad betrayed both vanity and mental weakness by saying, "O Lord, thou knowest that we saw in Europe much distress."

This class of sermonic materials should not only be used modestly but subserviently. That was a severe criticism passed on an eminent English clergyman and scholar: "I went," said the hearer, "to learn how I could find the way to heaven, but was only told the best route to modern Jerusalem."

THE DECOMPOSITION OF LITERARY PRODUCTIONS.

THE process of literary decomposition is the opposite of that employed in literary composition. It is the process of separating from one another the different ideas, illustrations, arguments, and other factors of a sermon, or a book, that they may be seen both individually and in their relation to the main idea. Decomposition is, therefore, the process of making an analysis or of tracing the lines of cleavage in a piece of literature. It is a process whose results will show whether or not the sermon or book is an organic growth or a mass of conglomerate. If a literary production cannot be decomposed it is certain that its logical arrangement is defective.

Decomposition, too, is a process whose importance to the literary worker cannot be overestimated. By engaging often in this task (for at the outset it will be a task) one's literary work will be much improved, one's mental faculties will be strengthened, and one's literary instincts and intuitions will be stimulated, or at least will be kept in growth.

The members of our Itinerants' Club whenever called on to master the contents of a book, whether in the Conference Course of Study or out of it, should subject that book, after perhaps the first reading, to the process of decomposition; let this be done pencil and paper in hand, or, if the memory is sufficient for these things, it may be done by what is termed the mental method.

As an illustration of decomposition we are pleased to present to our readers the following synopsis of Wesley's *Christian Perfection*, by the Rev. Stanley O. Royal, of Urbana, Ohio:

SYNOPSIS OF WESLEY'S PLAIN ACCOUNT OF CHRISTIAN PERFECTION.*

I. What is Christian perfection?

1. It is not perfection in knowledge, nor freedom from mistake (pp. 14, 17, 19), infirmities (p. 20), or temptations; nor is it that absolute perfection which is incapable of increase (pp. 35, 40, 60). It is not a state in which the atonement is not needed (pp. 16, 33, 43); nor is it "sinless perfection" (pp. 16, 33); nor is it an experience incapable of being lost (pp. 38, 43, 60). 2. Christian perfection is more than freedom from the commission of sin. Even babes in Christ are so far perfect (p. 2). It is freedom from evil desires and evil tempers, from fear, pride, self-will, and anger (p. 4). It is the renewal of the soul in the image of God, the purification of the heart by faith (p. 6). It is "walking in the light," "abiding in Christ," "rejoicing evermore," "loving God with all the heart, mind, soul, and strength" (pp. 14, 31), and "perfect love." These are Scripture expressions describing it.

II. Is Christian perfection an experience provided for all God's children?

The Scripture in many passages so teach (pp. 10-13). 1. By promise, both in the Old and New Testament; for example, Psa. cxxx, 8; Ezek. xxxvi, 25, 29; Deut. xxx, 6; 2 Cor. vii, 1; 1 John iii, 8; Eph. v, 25, 27; Rom. viii, 3, 4. 2. By prayers: "Deliver us from evil;" and John xvii, 20-23; Eph. iii, 14; 1 Thess. v, 23. 3. By commands: Matt. v, 48; xxii, 37. 4. By example: John (1 John iv, 17).

III. When may Christian perfection be obtained?

Not so early as justification (Heb. vi, 1). Not necessarily so late as at death (Phil. iii, 15). This is evident from the nature of a command, which is given to the living, not to the dead (p. 12). See also the Scriptures, Tit. ii, 11-14; Luke i, 69-75; 1 John i, 7, 9; iv, 17. These passages speak of a deliverance from sin in this world and in this present life (p. 12). It begins the moment a person is justified. It is preceded by a gradual work of mortification of sin, often of long duration, but it may be, by man's good leave, cut short in an instantaneous death unto sin (p. 40).

*The references in parentheses are to the book herein summarized, where these brief statements are fully elaborated. The only suggestion we make is with regard to the division marks. There should be uniformity. We recommend the following: Volumes I, II, III. Parts I, II, III. Chapters I, II, III. Main Divisions I, II, III. First Subdivisions 1, 2, 3. Second Subdivisions (1), (2), (3). Third Subdivisions a, b, c. Fourth Subdivisions (a), (b), (c).

IV. How may Christian perfection be obtained ?

Not by careless indifference nor indolent inactivity (p. 23). But in universal, zealous, watchful, self-denying obedience. Especially by prayer, fasting, and the use of all the means of grace (p. 24). At last it is received instantaneously, and by simple faith (p. 23).

V. How may a person know that he has obtained it ?

1. By his having had a deep and clear conviction of inbred sin, followed by a consciousness of total death to sin and of renewal in the image of God (p. 22). 2. But chiefly by the direct witness of the Spirit to his sanctification (pp. 36, 37): 1 John v, 19; 1 John iii, 24; 1 Cor. ii, 12; Rom. viii, 16. 3. Indirectly by the fruit of the Spirit, love, joy, peace, patience, resignation, fidelity, temperance, etc. (p. 39).

VI. Ought one who has experienced Christian perfection to profess it (p. 17) ?

At first he could hardly help it. Afterward he could refrain. Then it is advisable not to speak of it to them who know not God, nor to others without some particular reason (p. 18). It must be professed cautiously, reverently, and with the deepest humility, lest one appear to boast (p. 18). By entire silence crosses might be avoided, but this could not be done with a clear conscience.

VII. May the person in the experience of Christian perfection enjoy pleasures of sense (p. 20).

He may, but he needs none of them to make him happy. He uses them, but does not seek them. He uses them sparingly, and not for the sake of the thing itself.

VIII. How may we recognize the possession of this blessing in another (p. 19) ?

We cannot infallibly. But we must be content with reasonable proofs. Such as a previous exemplary life and a truthful character, a distinct account of the manner of the change, and a holy life of unblamable actions.

IX. How shall the preacher treat those who profess this blessing (p. 18) ?

He should talk freely with them and examine them carefully concerning their experience, avoiding harshness, sternness, or contempt (p. 25). For his own sake he must not make himself an inquisitor-general or peremptory judge of the deep things of God. He must labor to prevent the unjust or unkind treatment of those who profess it. And he must exhort them to pray fervently that God would show them all that is in their heart.

X. What advices may be given those who profess Christian perfection ?

1. Watch against spiritual pride (p. 44). 2. Beware of enthusiasm, fanaticism, or schism (p. 45). 3. Beware of making void the law through faith. 4. Beware of bigotry, self-indulgence, and of sins of omission. 5. Be exemplary in all things, especially the little things, for in these lie dangers as well as blessings.

QUESTIONS RELATING TO THE CHOICE OF A SERMON
SUBJECT.

THE preacher has chosen his text and has struck its key-note. That key-note is the thought which he is expected to develop and apply; it is, therefore, the subject of his sermon. He next puts that thought or subject into words. He then has a proposition which he can look at. At this point he may ask himself questions like these:

First. Is the subject more clearly deducible from this text than is any other, and is it the most useful thought in the text?

Bear in mind, that a thought only *possibly* in the text is not the proper thought to deduce from a text; a thought, too, may unquestionably be in a text, and yet may not be the most useful thought to deduce from that text.

Second. Has this subject the luster of gold or only the glitter of brass?

Third. Has it a definite meaning which can be put into a simple proposition?

Fourth. Has the wording of the subject as great rhetorical excellence as its nature allows?

Fifth. Will the subject enable me to give my sick parishioners the medicine they need rather than some theory of medicine which may be of no more service to them than a proposition in Euclid?

Sixth. Is it probable that the good of the people will be as much promoted by a discussion of this as by that of any other subject within my range?

Seventh. Is the subject chosen suited to my aptitudes and acquirements?

Eighth. Can I command for this subject ample material and proof?

Ninth. Are there considerations of circumstance, time, or place that call for or justify the choice of the subject I have selected?

Tenth. Do I have a distinct and an *energetic* sense of the importance of the subject chosen? If not, can I obtain it?

Eleventh. Has the spirit of evangelical love for the people influenced me in the choice of my subject?

Twelfth. Have I chosen this subject for "Christ's sake?"

Thirteenth. Are there indications that God wills for me to preach on this subject?

This conviction that "God wills" may lead to mistakes, but it affords mighty inspirations; it enables one to work with "terrible confidence." The counter conviction, or even suspicion, that God has had nothing to do with the choice of the subject, will rob a conscientious man of much enthusiasm.

Fourteenth. May not this be the last subject on which I shall be permitted to preach?

FOREIGN RÉSUMÉ.

SOME LEADERS OF THOUGHT.

EDUARD LANGHAUS.

In the death of Professor Langhaus, of the chair of systematic theology of Berne, that University has lost one of its ablest men. He had a somewhat tempestuous history. In 1865 he wrote a work entitled, *The Holy Scriptures: A Guide for Religious Instruction*. He had previously been instructor in religion in the Teachers' Seminary of Berne. This book revealed his liberal theological tendencies. A general storm of surprise and indignation arose that a man in so important a position should hold such views. But the personal influence of the man is seen in the fact that he succeeded in securing the right of his form of theological belief to be taught in the canton of Berne. He was a follower of the Tübingen school, and was one of its last representatives. His efforts were largely directed toward popularizing theology with the laity. His thorough understanding of all the problems involved enabled him to simplify both language and form of statement, and thus in a large measure accomplish his purpose. He is also worthy of mention because he belonged to a movement in Switzerland which corresponds to that which in Germany is controlled by the "Protestant Association." Their effort is to so conceive religion as to make it harmonize with current thought. While the Ritschl school claims that we need not concern ourselves with the conflicts of science and religion, because theology has to do only with those matters which lie outside of the realm of science—and while the Confessional School adheres to the old confessions of faith even in opposition to science—the Protestant Association interprets Scripture and writes theology in such a way as to avoid a conflict with science. According to them all truth must be taken into account in theology. Their mistake is in confusing departments which have a separate existence. While all truth is a unit, and in a sense must be considered as a whole, yet to include philosophy in theology, or the reverse, is to make a fatal mistake. It has resulted in robbing Christianity, in the minds of its adherents, of all those qualities which make it impressive to the uneducated mind. As a result, the Association commands the sympathy of the masses in a very small degree, and in this degree only because among the masses there is (though limited in its area) a deep-rooted prejudice against the saving truths of Christianity. The Protestant Association is not numerically strong, and as one attends their assemblies one is impressed that their chief rejoicing is in the destructive work which they have accomplished for themselves and are trying to accomplish for others. In future articles other special leaders and their particular doctrines will be mentioned. Professor Langhaus was one of a constantly diminishing number of men who take a decidedly negative attitude toward the New Testament and the profoundest truths of Christianity. "Liberalism" in Germany, as everywhere, is always and in every particular a failure.

A VETERAN GERMAN THEOLOGIAN.

PROFESSOR BERNHARD WEISS, of the University of Berlin, is recognized the world over as one of the ablest of German exegetes and New Testament scholars. His principal works are, a *Life of Christ*, an *Introduction to the New Testament*, *Biblical Theology of the New Testament*, and commentaries on several of the New Testament books. For some time past he has been engaged upon a new edition of *Meyer's Commentary*. He introduces his own comments, often contrary to those of Meyer, but does not issue the work as his own. His many students regret that he does not write an entirely independent commentary. On New Testament questions he stands so high in Germany that no one is content until he knows the opinion of Weiss. Like most of the greater German theologians, he does not like to be classed as an adherent of any school. Yet he is neither in harmony with the Confessional School nor with the Protestant Association, but stands midway between them. He is, in fact, a leader in the so-called "Mediating School." The name is somewhat misleading, since they do not to-day exercise any mediating influence between the opposing theological parties. They are a sort of eclectic school. They try to hold fast to the generally accepted confessions, yet they will not discard the results of rationalistic and critical investigation. The consequence is, that they satisfy nobody but themselves. The Confessionalists feel that they yield too much, the Protestant Association that they yield too little. Professor Weiss's personal attitude toward the extremest theological positions may be seen in the fact that he was chiefly instrumental in securing the much-opposed Professor Harnack for Berlin. In defense, he said that if the orthodox party could not produce a refutation of Harnack they cannot blame the world for accepting his teachings. Professor Weiss does not deny the miracles of the New Testament. Yet, after the fashion of the rationalists, he seems to delight in a natural explanation of them whenever possible. Of all methods of dealing with the miracles this is the most objectionable. If Christ performed miracles, which Weiss admits, then the question is simply one of the authenticity of the records of them. When no doubt can be cast upon the record, it is playing fast and loose with revelation to explain a miracle as a natural event. It betrays a prejudice against miracles as such to proceed in this way. When one recognizes this weakness in his method it helps to explain many special conclusions at which he has arrived. For example, when he denies the bodily resurrection of Christ, and claims that Paul does not teach it in 1 Cor. xv, and asserts that the teaching there is of a purely spiritual resurrection, one remembers that he explains miracles away whenever possible. Or when one finds him denying the historical accuracy of Acts ii, and affirming that no such event ever transpired as is there recorded, we are prepared to question the trustworthiness of his conclusions. He denies that Matthew wrote the gospel of that name. In order to prove that the author was not a Palestinian Jew he points out a number of supposed geographical inaccuracies. As an evidence that the writer of Matthew did not draw from his own information he affirms that

he did not even know that Joseph and Mary had originally lived in Nazareth. This remarkable assertion, which, however, he accepts from other sources, he bases upon Matthew ii, 22, 23. It is true that this is not by any means his whole argument. But it plainly shows that he is dependent upon very doubtful arguments for his conclusions. Yet in this Professor Weiss is not peculiar. The negative critics are all alike. They have a point to make, and how are they straitened until they make it! Little is the wonder that in their perplexity they resort to every expedient which can possibly be turned to their advantage. Yet Weiss stands in the main for evangelical truth, and his soberer instincts seem to show him that the way of a negative critic is a hard and dangerous path.

RECENT THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

TWO BOOKS THAT HAVE MADE A NOISE.

ONE of them is the *Earnest Thoughts* of Herr von Egidy. It is not necessary to characterize it further than to say that it represents very much the stand-point of Unitarianism and of *Robert Elsmere*. But because it was written by an army officer, in a popular style, and was addressed to the masses rather than to scholars, it had a most remarkable sale. Forty thousand copies were issued in a few weeks. The excitement concerning it has already died out. The other book is *The Historical Christ*, by Henry Ziegler, pastor in Liegnitz. On account of the sentiments contained in it the author has been cited to appear before his consistory for trial. The army officer lost his position for writing *Earnest Thoughts*. At this writing it is too early to predict what will be the outcome of Ziegler's trial. Ziegler treats the biblical account of the creation as purely religious, instead of scientific. He also adopts Wellhausen's view, that the Prophets, and not the Law, formed the foundation of the Old Testament religion. Yet he does not deny the fact of revelation in the Law or the Prophets. Neither is his teaching concerning Christ new. He insists on the Christ of history as against the Christ of dogma, the difference between the two being clear to him even if not to others. He affirms that from age to age the opinions of the schools and the teachings of the theologians have mixed themselves with the truth concerning Christ, and thus have prevented man from having a clear vision of him, and robbed him of his power to meet their hearts' needs. The current view of Christ he declares to be a web of prejudice and unfounded human opinions. Nor has he sinned above others in his statements concerning the gospels. He rejects the gospel of John, and asserts that much in the synoptic gospels is historically untenable. And even when he declares that Jesus "sprang from the root of David on his father's side," thus making him a son of man in the most literal sense, he is only following the commentator Meyer, who affirms that the words of Jesus in John v, 27, are to be understood only of a human fatherhood, and that the idea of a supernatural conception of the body of Jesus is nowhere to be found in the writings of

Paul. Why, then, should Ziegler be brought to trial for such utterances, while others teach them without molestation? It looks as though the boasted freedom of theological thought in Germany were about to come to an end. And indeed it is high time. It has been borne with, lo! these many years. But it has failed to bring forth the expected fruit. Perhaps the authorities will now forbid that it shall longer cumber the ground.

AN IMPORTANT NEW TESTAMENT WORK.

WHILE the conservative and the orthodox go quietly on their way, the radical and the self-styled progressist are noisy. The impression is thus sometimes made that only in the ranks of the destructive critics is there any real independent thought and investigation. The appearance, therefore, of such a work as the *History of the New Testament Revelation*, by Professor Dr. C. F. Noesgen, of the University of Rostock, is a noteworthy event. Such works are indeed continually falling from the German press. But because they maintain the orthodox positions little attention is given them, however scholarly their method and treatment may be. Only the first half of the first volume has appeared; but it contains the introduction, which explains and defends the principles upon which the author proceeds, and also the history of Jesus to the call of the twelve. Thus far he displays a comprehensive and scholarly mastery of the subject of which he treats. He holds decidedly to oral tradition as the human source of the gospels, rejecting the complicated documentary theories. A few of his fundamental principles are as follows: The appearance of Christ connects with the history of the world, yet it is something entirely new and peculiar in the world. Christianity is not the mere fruit of the development of the human spirit, as Schleiermacher and Baur held; nor can Christianity be identified with the effects of Christianity in the first Christians. Christianity can only be understood when it is accepted as a truly supernatural energy and power. Hence the history of revelation is something other than the history of a religion; and the history of the New Testament revelation is something other than the history of the original Church and of original Christianity. So, too, the New Testament writings are not records of the Christian conceptions of the original congregations, but the utterances of God in his self-revelation. The preaching of the apostles is a part of the New Testament revelation. New Testament history and New Testament theology cannot be separated. The expression "Son of God" nowhere in the Bible designates a mere loving relation of Christ with the Father, but their equality of substance. It expresses Christ's consciousness of his origin. These propositions fly in the face of nearly all the presuppositions of those who have done so much to undermine faith in revelation as divine, and in Christ as the Son of God. We can here point out but a few of the important results of such a view. It has been surreptitiously assumed that the New Testament writings sprang from and represented the conception of the early Christians concerning Christianity. It is a most plausible assumption. Who could be better

able to record the facts and principles of Christ's teachings than these same first Christians? It was too early for any great errors to have crept in. Hence revelation, in the strict sense, is unnecessary. Noesgen has attacked the enemy's left flank. Is there a true revelation from God, or have we in the New Testament merely the impressions of men? The early Christians were indeed in a position to know what Christ had taught and done. But these same early Christians were only men; and all the intellectual limitations and the religious prejudices, and all the imperfection of moral ideas which adhere to even the best of regenerate mankind must have operated to mold their conception of Christianity. Hence their record could not be that of Christianity, but of their conception of it. Only on such a supposition could such a work as that of Harnack's *Dogmengeschichte* have any significance. It is perfectly legitimate to inquire into the accuracy and trustworthiness of scriptural Christianity if the New Testament is the product of Christian minds, and not of the Spirit of God. Every additional proposition is of almost equal importance. It is a matter of rejoicing that the masses of the German theologians in and out of the pulpit have again found so able a champion of their faith as Noesgen in his *History of the New Testament Revelation*.

JUSTIFICATION FROM AN EVANGELICAL AUSTRIAN'S STAND-POINT.

THROUGHOUT the German-speaking population of Europe there is scarcely a dogmatic work written in these days which does not in some way depend for its form and substance upon the writings of Ritschl. In the recent work of Professor Dr. E. Boehl, professor of theology in the evangelical faculty of Vienna, on *Justification by Faith*, this is pre-eminently the case. He points out that there are two extremes concerning this doctrine. One is that of the Mystics, who build justification upon an inherent righteousness in man; the other is the extreme rationalistic-ethical, which makes the forgiveness of sin the presupposition of the individual's own Christian activity. Orthodoxy, he claims, holds the middle path between these two. Of the second extreme he takes Ritschl as the representative. The shortest and best refutation of Boehl's own teachings is a statement of them. He affirms, in opposition to Mysticism, that connected with justification no kind of inner change takes place in the justified; that there is no kind of change of the spiritual substance, so to speak, nor any impartation of moral or spiritual qualities. To him justification is simply and solely the imputation to the justified of the merit, the active and passive obedience, of Christ. Accordingly, he claims that original sin consists alone in the imputation of Adam's guilt to man. In order to overcome original sin, therefore, it is only necessary to impute the obedience of another Adam. If a proof were needed that America is in advance of Germany in scriptural and reasonable dogmatics a comparison of the above doctrines with the purpose to revise the Calvinistic creeds will furnish it. Sin remains in the justified after justification just as before, and will remain until he is taken to heaven. Regeneration and justification are simultaneous in so

far that the Holy Spirit testifies to the sinner of God's changed attitude toward him, and thus brings about a change in the sinner's feeling toward God. Sanctification consists in the fruit which the Holy Ghost produces in the justified, without in any way joining himself with the person of the sinner. In fact, the sinner is nothing but the channel through which the Holy Spirit operates, so that these works have nothing whatever to do with the righteousness of man. This is not the place to defend or assail Ritschl. But it is surely better with him to emphasize the responsibility of the justified person than with Bochl to set him altogether free from moral obligation. Such a theology is possible only where the Scripture is interpreted by means of the intellect alone, under the influence of a specific form of anthropology. What Germany needs is just what it least wants—that is, a liberal infusion into its theology of Wesleyan Arminianism.

TENDENCIES IN GERMAN THEOLOGICAL LITERATURE.

IN the May-June number of the *Review* mention was made of the results of specialization in German general literature. The same tendency is seen within German theological literature. Exegetics thinks it must work out the meaning of Scripture with means drawn exclusively from its own domain, and repels the encroachments of dogmatics. Historical theology demands the same freedom from dogmatic presuppositions, and claims the right to undermine the results both of exegetics and dogmatics. Dogmatics is a veritable Caiaphas, and says to exegetics and history, "Ye know nothing at all." Practical theology disdains the disputes between the other three departments, and claims that it alone represents the spirit of Christ in ignoring critical questions and carrying the Gospel to man. "In those days there was no king in Israel, but every man did that which was right in his own eyes." In affairs of government we call such a condition of things anarchy. It is little less in the world of German thought and literature. Those who are interested in education see the remedy for all the social ills of Germany in the reform of the educational system, and of making of many books on the subject there is no end. One branch of those whose efforts are bent mostly toward social reform think that the Jews must be expelled, or at least repressed, if Germany is to be saved religiously, morally, socially, intellectually, and financially. Still others see no good, but only ill, in all this agitation about the Jews. They see the remedy in a complete change of the governmental system. Men must have equal rights. There must be no privileged class. Every one must be supplied with work and be required to work. Religion they can do without. The Church is unnecessary. All these tendencies, and a host of others, are represented in recent German literature, and clash with such violence that it is high time for the disciples to cry out, "Master, we perish!" The one hopeful sign is the tendency toward the practical in religion. On the one side the orthodox theologians emphasize with renewed vigor the importance of maintaining the Lutheran doctrine just as it is found in the accepted symbols of the

Church, and on the other they insist upon a practical Christianity, which with most of them means an effort to do good to the souls and bodies of men. These two do not appear in their eyes so much the single fruit of the same tree as separate trees from the same soil. In the opposing liberal theological camp equal stress is laid upon doctrine, although not upon orthodox doctrine. The Bible is in the loosest sense the revelation or word of God. Theological statements must give way before the teachings of science and philosophy. Every new-fangled theory receives a patient hearing, and the presses are kept hot in the publication of books and pamphlets. If the inadequacy of an hypothesis cannot be pointed out it is accepted as established, and the creed must be modified accordingly at whatever cost to the faith. But meantime, while accepting the conclusions of the enemies of the Gospel, and thus undermining the foundation of morality, they too cry aloud for a "practical Christianity," which with them means upright living and a good degree of benevolence. All this but illustrates the evils of exclusive specialization. That profounder scholarship is thereby attained is not to be doubted; but breadth of vision is at the same time rendered impossible. The literature of every department finds its end in itself. Hence schools are formed. A school is of necessity partial, not complete, in its sphere of ideas. When we add to this the fact that scientific theology in Germany prides itself upon its purity of aim—that is, in aiming at the discovery and statement of the truth for the truth's sake, and without regard to the practical value or the modifying influences of comparison of truth in one department with truth in another—we have the main principles which underlie German theological literature.

RELIGIOUS.

EVANGELICAL CHRISTIANITY IN RUSSIA.

NOTWITHSTANDING the bigotry of the Russian ecclesiastical authorities and the narrow and antiquated policy of the government, Christianity in its evangelical form lives and grows. There are several "sects" which are especially active in propagating the truth of the Gospel and in insisting upon a living Christianity. Among them is one whose name, if translated into English, would be "Hourists." They sprang from some pietistic German settlers in Russia, and maintain in a considerable measure the peculiarities of their spiritual progenitors. Another sect is called the "Christians." They also insist upon personal piety and a strict morality, with abstinence from strong drink, tobacco, theaters, and other worldly amusements. They also carefully observe the Sabbath. The Baptists, too, have a good work in progress. Not the least encouraging feature of evangelicalism in Russia is the ready acceptance which the Bible finds under the labors of the agents of the British and Foreign Bible Society. During last year 479,403 copies of the Bible were distributed, nearly all of which were purchased by those who received them.

SPREAD OF THE IRVINGITES IN GERMANY.

WHILE Irvingism has not been very prosperous in Great Britain, in Germany the growth of this sect is such as to attract the attention of all careful observers. The question is being asked, How is this growth to be accounted for? One reason is said to be that they began their activity in Germany in the midst of the revolutionary excitement of 1848, when men were ready to believe in the early return of Christ to reign upon the earth, together with the earnestness with which this doctrine was proclaimed by Irvingite missionaries. Another reason is characterized as the insincere and deceitful effort of the missionaries of this sect to make their hearers believe that they do not mean to form a new denomination, their practice, on the contrary, being to form their adherents into congregations as soon as possible. They are then prejudiced against the Churches to which they belong, and urged to forsake them and attend the services of the Irvingites. A third reason given is the fact that the Irvingites do not recognize themselves as a Church along-side of other Churches, but as the true apostolic Church inclusive of all others. The fact is that the State Church feels itself profoundly injured that it alone seems helpless to exercise influence, while the smallest sects grow and develop. The reason is probably in the fact that the Irvingites employ the laity in their Churches. Let the German Lutheran Churches so do, and they will begin at once to feel new life in every part.

ROMAN CATHOLIC TACTICS IN GERMANY AGAIN.

It is not alone in doctrinal matters that the Roman Catholics of Germany try to prejudice the Protestants against the Church to which they belong. They enter the field of literature as well, and systematically disparage Protestant authors according to the supposed necessities of the case. A number of Roman Catholic authors are giving their time to this delectable work of misrepresenting Protestantism. Herder, Goethe, Paulus, and Schleiermacher have lately been described for the general reader. In particular was Schleiermacher hardly handled. Certain unfortunate facts of his life were singled out and treated as though characteristic of him. Ridicule and contempt were thus poured upon one of the most honored names of the Protestant Church. Of course, such books deceive none but the ignorant; but the misfortune is that the masses, to whom they are addressed, are ignorant. Furthermore, they are already sufficiently prejudiced against their pastors and Church, and need only such a book to make them lose all confidence in their spiritual guides. But they employ still more dangerous weapons when they enter the political arena. In the German parliament they have one hundred members. They are, or have been, a compact body. Under the leadership of Windhorst, "his little excellence," they voted as a unit. America should take warning from the situation in Germany.

EDITORIAL REVIEWS.

SPIRIT OF THE REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

THE recent Wesley Centenary Observances called forth from the press both in America and England much comment, mostly appreciative, on the character and work of Wesley. That great leader of public opinion in Great Britain, the *London Times*, remarked, that "The Church of England is what it is because John Wesley lived and taught in the last century." The denominational organs of our American Churches, as well as our secular press, have also been unstinted in their recognition of the grand spiritual results of the Wesleyan movement. But that expositor of the theories of the High Church party in the Protestant Episcopal Church, the *Church Review*, had a querulous paper from the pen of a correspondent in whose eyes the "beam" of apostolic succession is so large as to prevent his perception of little else than the "mote" of Wesley's ecclesiastical irregularity and the seemingly alleged inconsistency apparent in his ordination of Coke to the office of superintendent. The spiritual insensibility which prevents a minister of Christ from feeling grateful to God for that gift of power through which Wesley saved both the English nation and its national Church from being overwhelmed by the prevailing wickedness of those times is both astounding and pitiable. As to Wesley's irregularity, it need only be said that he had the courage of his convictions, and regarded obedience to the will of God as more binding on his conscience than the rubrics of his Church as they were, and still are, interpreted by High Church luminaries.

As to Wesley's alleged inconsistency, it suffices to say that though he was originally a High Churchman, he was convinced, in 1746, by reading Lord King's *Primitive Church* and Stillingfleet's *Irenicum*—both Churchmen—that presbyters and bishops are "the same order and have the same inherent right to ordain." For various reasons he abstained from exercising this right until the exigencies of his societies in Scotland and in America made its exercise needful to their spiritual welfare. Then urged, not by the pleas of his advisers, nor by the impulses of approaching imbecility, as this writer presumes to insinuate, but by his convictions of duty, he laid his hands on Coke, thus ordaining him to the office of a superintendent for the American societies. In like manner, he ordained Whatcoat and Vasey as presbyters. In doing this he acted in perfect consistency with his long-cherished convictions and with his professed purpose to follow the guidance of divine providence and of the Holy Spirit.

This *Church Review* writer also dwells at length on Bishop Coke's correspondence with Bishop White respecting closer union between the Methodist Episcopal and the Protestant Episcopal Churches. He ignores the fact that it was not *organic* but closer fraternal union that Coke sought,

as he himself explained to the General Conference of 1784. Coke's error lay in his willingness to accept a reconsecration at the hands of Bishop White. Yet this disposition was not born of any doubt respecting the validity of his ordination by Wesley, but of his desire to promote intimate and active fellowship between the two Churches concerned. His offer may have been unwise, but his motive was pure. Coke was heroic in his devotion to Christ and to Methodism. While he loved the Church of England he also loved the Church in America, because he recognized their spiritual possibilities, and he longed to see the latter united to Methodism in the bonds of a mutually sympathetic affection. And if the critic in the *Church Review* was possessed by the same spirit his pen would be animated, not by a narrow sectarian prejudice, which is blind to the magnificent record of Methodism, but by a charity sufficiently broad to rejoice in its success and deep enough to encourage his own Church to emulate its zeal. Both Churches have one Master: why should they not be united in Christian love and in active zeal for the conversion of the world?

THE *Presbyterian and Reformed Review* for April discusses: 1. "Recent Dogmatic Thought in Scotland;" 2. "The Value of the Vulgate Old Testament for Textual Criticism;" 3. "Christianity and Tolerance;" 4. "Mr. Gore on the Holy Spirit and Inspiration;" 5. "Looking Backward;" 6. "The Proposition for Federal Union Between the Two Reformed Churches;" 7. "Presbyterian Union in India." In the first of these papers Principal John Cairns sketches with a luminous pen the various phases of dogmatic Christian thought shown in the writings of Scottish theologians during the last quarter of a century. He finds these theologians substantially sound on the doctrines of the Trinity, the incarnation, the atonement, justification, sanctification, the freedom of the will, election, and the last things. German heterodoxy has not removed them from biblical truth; albeit, his admissions do suggest that their Calvinism is materially modified, at least in expression. The second paper, after critically comparing a considerable number of Jerome's renderings in the Vulgate with the Greek Testament, concludes that, while far inferior to the Septuagint, "for a really critical text the Vulgate is an indispensable authority." Yet "to be of adequate use it must first be published in a critical edition." The third paper treats a question which, owing to conditions created by the numerous phases of religious opinion held by immigrants from all nations, is destined to become vital before long. How to maintain our national theory of "a free Church in a free State" is the problem discussed very ably in this statesman-like paper. In the fourth paper Dr. Robert Watts, of Belfast College, exposes, with a logic which is as pungent as it is conclusive, the fallacies of the *Luz Mundi* essays in general and of Mr. Gore in particular. He makes it evident that those essays "are a confused medley of High Churchism and Broad Churchism, and the latter for the sake of the former." He shows that "they accept the unverified hypotheses of critics and scientists, and endeavor to construe the faith once delivered to the saints so as to conciliate

those errant speculators." The fifth paper convicts the author of *Looking Backward* of the unwisdom of presenting "a dream of one minor idea as a serious workable scheme for social redemption." The sixth article is a symposium which makes it clear that the missionaries of the Presbyterian Church in India are not a unit in their views of the desirability of the organic union of the Presbyterian Churches in that great country. Evidently the Presbyterian system is not as flexible as our connectionalism.

THE *Bibliotheca Sacra* for April has: 1. "A Presbyterian's View of Congregationalism;" 2. "Science and Prayer;" 3. "The Data and Method of Philosophy;" 4. "Suggestions as to Modifications of the Dogmatic System Taught in the Congregational Schools and Churches, Required at the Present Time;" 5. "The Reformed System and the Larger Hope;" 6. "Recent Discoveries Bearing on the Antiquity of Man;" 7. "Notes of Delitzsch on True and False Defense of the Bible;" 8. "The Gospel in the Sermon on the Mount." Of these papers we note as of special value the third, in which Dr. E. H. Merrel discusses with keen discrimination and scientific breadth the "data" and "method of philosophy," and claims on good grounds "that the best thinking of the world is bringing us to the sure conclusion that theism is to be the triumphant final philosophy." In the fourth paper Dr. Frank Foster, of Oberlin, presents cogent reasons in favor of teaching systematic theology, in theological seminaries, by a method fitted to counteract the current drift of thought occasioned by the wide diffusion of scientific facts and of the new materialistic philosophy. He would build systematic theology on the fact of "a living Church as a supernatural institution;" and on "Christian experience as a source of doctrine," carefully separating "the elements contributed by reason and those derived from the word of God," and teaching it after the inductive method. This paper is deeply thoughtful, timely, and suggestive, especially to professors of theology and to preachers. The fifth paper contends pretty conclusively that the dogma of "the larger hope" is like a house built on the sand. The sixth article treats of recent discoveries of human relics on the Pacific coast, which go far to discredit materialistic theories of evolution, and may disturb our opinions concerning the antiquity of man in America.

THE *Unitarian Review* for April has: 1. "By Way of Combination;" 2. "A Chaplain of the Revolution;" 3. "Papal Tradition;" 4. "A Bird's-eye View of American Literature." The first of these papers claims forcibly, if not conclusively, that the gigantic combinations of capital characterizing the world of to-day are counterparts of the ancient despotisms and of the modern "trust," some of the doings of which latter form of combination, it says, "seem like gigantic images of those deeds which the Vikings in their grim humor called gathering property." It also sees in these trusts the germs of counter-combinations among hand-workers, which, if not checked by the "divine element in mankind, must lead toward man's ruin."

THE *Theological Monthly* for April discusses: 1. "The Nature and Limits of Inspiration;" 2. "Permissible Hope;" 3. "The Tabernacle and the Temple;" 4. "The Now and Then;" 5. "The Gift of Tongues." Of these papers we note the first, which rejects the *mechanical* and *verbal* theory of inspiration, and contends somewhat tentatively for the *dynamical* theory, which holds that though the *substance* of Holy Scripture is divine its *form* was determined by the personal character and circumstances of its writers. What the idea of inspiration actually involves, it claims, demands a more exhaustive and definite inquiry than has hitherto been made. The second article finds no ground in Scripture for the "larger hope," but contends that the wideness of God's mercy permits us to hope that none will be doomed to endless death except those who choose to cling to their cherished corruptions. The fifth article argues that the speaking with tongues at Pentecost was caused by the direct impulse of the Holy Ghost so working on the memory as to enable its subjects to recollect speeches which they had heard in times past from foreigners of different nations visiting the temple! This theory, though plausibly sustained, cannot be accepted as the solution of that wonderful manifestation of divine power. The miraculous speaking is a well-attested fact. But how God wrought on its subjects to produce it no man can tell, any more than he can how the world sprang into existence when it was commanded to be.

THE *Lutheran Quarterly* for April treats of: 1. "The Theology of Zwingli;" 2. "The Abyssinians and their Church;" 3. "The Final Philosophy;" 4. "Reminiscences of Rev. John Uhlhorn;" 5. "Massillon;" 6. "Practical View of the Common Service;" 7. "The Lutheran Sources of the Common Service;" 8. "The Influence of the Church in the Organization of Modern Europe;" 9. "Lutheranism in the General Synod." The first of these articles shows, by many citations, how "fundamentally different the theology of Zwingli is from the theology of Luther." It claims, but scarcely proves, that the former is the theology of rationalism and the latter the theology of faith in the word of God. Its writer is evidently prepossessed in favor of Luther and prejudiced against Zwingli, both of whose great minds were more or less influenced by their early papistical training. The theological opinions of both should be read in the light of this fact. The second article is a skillfully condensed historical sketch of a remarkable people, who, though of Semitic origin, accepted Christianity from Greece, repelled Mohammedanism, remained isolated from and unknown to modern nations through ten centuries, but who since their rediscovery in the sixteenth century have become known as the possessors of a valuable Christian literature, and are now seeking political relations with Europe through the Italian government. To many the facts stated in this article will be a sort of historical revelation. In the third paper we have a lucid digest of the varied systems of philosophy which thoughtful men have devised to guide them in their search "for the real nature and cause of things." Those systems not having fully satisfied the demands of reason, the writer contends that a final system will yet

be reached which, beginning with the facts of consciousness, the universe, self, and God, will take the demand of reason for an infinite, intelligent, personal God as a fixed point from which to explain being, the existence of itself, and of the world. Working from this point, it will discover the rationality of revelation, and thus bring philosophy and religion into mutually helpful relations. The fifth paper vividly illustrates the oratory of Massillon, whom it correctly describes as the most abundantly eloquent and the most Ciceronian of the great voices which filled and moved the age of Louis XIV. In the eighth paper we have in bold outline a record of the amazing formative power of Christianity as seen in bringing the order of modern civilization out of the *débris* of the ruined Roman Empire. Impressed as one is in reading this article by its evidence of the presence of God in the ancient Church, one can scarcely avoid sighing and exclaiming, "If God did all this with so much corruption in his Church, how much grander would his work have been had the Church kept his faith pure and her garments free from the pollutions of sin!" The ninth article shows that among our Lutheran brethren there are some who cry, "I am of Luther!" and others, "I am of Melancthon!" The former stand for the "Augsburg Confession," pure and simple; the latter hold that Confession too, but with interpretations which modify some of its essential features. As in the Presbyterian Church, so in the Lutheran, a wider type of Calvinism is called for.

THE *London Quarterly Review* for April contains: 1. "Some Men and Women of the Revolution;" 2. "Philip H. Gosse, a Puritan Naturalist;" 3. "The Writings of Dean Church;" 4. "Professor W. Kitchen Parker;" 5. "A Plea for Liberty;" 6. "Lord Houghton;" 7. "The Rewards and Responsibilities of Medical Practice;" 8. "The Critical Problem of Isaiah." The first six of these eminently readable papers are admirably written reviews of the works named. They give the pith of those works, combined with judicious criticisms on their literary qualities and value. The fifth paper is especially timely, because it exhibits with logical acumen and conclusiveness the paradoxical and impossible demands of socialism. In the seventh paper we have a sketch of the steps by which medical education in England has risen from the illiteracy of the ancient barber-surgeons to its present high standard. The earnings, difficulties, drawbacks, burdensome toils, petty vexations, high responsibilities, rewards, and benevolent aspects of the medical profession are also vividly described. Our physicians may read it with interest, and chronic invalids may learn to be less vexatious to their doctors than many of them perhaps unintentionally are. The eighth paper presents with remarkable clearness a summary of the arguments of both conservative and rationalistic combatants respecting the dualistic authorship of the Book of Isaiah. It claims that while the best scholars of all schools concede that there are genuine prophecies both in the earlier and later portions of Isaiah, yet the balance of evidence on the whole is against the unity of its authorship. Nevertheless, it holds with Delitzsch that the influence of criticism on exegesis in the Book of

Isaiah amounts to nothing. The seal of inspiration is, on the whole, its spiritual lesson and perennial value. The duality of its authorship, even if it be probable, has not been demonstrated.

THE *Quarterly Review of the United Brethren in Christ* for April discusses: 1. "The So-called Proofs for the Existence of God;" 2. "The Poet and the Priest of Nature;" 3. "Historical Development of Church Music;" 4. "The Church Recreant;" 5. "Eloquence." In the first of these ably written papers Dr. W. O. Krohn, after pointing out the insufficiency of the ontological, cosmological, and teleological arguments to prove the existence of God, strongly contends that human reason finds satisfaction, not in those arguments, but only in the postulate of a personal Being as the immanent ground of the world. The world is not *identified* with its ground, as pantheism teaches, but is *distinguished* from it. The second paper is beautifully written. It shows how such poets as David, Homer, Dante, Milton, Walter Scott, Wordsworth, Bryant, Longfellow, etc., being priests of nature, have interpreted to us the laws of the visible world, and the ideas and laws of man's moral and spiritual nature. The ministry of the poet, he concludes, is to "bring God's solace in nature to the hearts of the people." The third paper briefly traces the development of church music from the day of Jubal to the present time, and justly claims that "the higher the type of religion, the higher also has been the type of music." The fourth paper is drastic and pessimistic. It scourges the Churches with pitiless severity. Its writer means well, but his pictures of existing church life, though true in part, are blacker than facts warrant. The fifth paper is a concise and forcibly written analysis of the qualities which are necessary to make an effective orator. "Any one," it says, "may learn to be eloquent," in the sense "that he who can arouse and persuade men from wrong to right is truly eloquent."

THE *Presbyterian Quarterly* for April discusses: 1. "Burney's Soteriology and the Cumberland Theology;" 2. "The Scriptural Idea of the Church;" 3. "The Doctrine of Inspiration;" 4. "The Deluge;" 5. "The Christian Endeavor Movement;" 6. "Bledsøe's Theory of Moral Freedom." Of these articles we note the third as an able, critical, discriminative, and in the main sound, presentation of the doctrine of inspiration; and the fourth as a condensed and luminous account of the traditions respecting the Deluge, of the Mosaic history concerning it, and of the strong support given to the Bible account of it by the most recent testimony of science. It is a valuable paper.

THE *Quarterly Review of the Methodist Episcopal Church, South*, has: 1. "Peter Akers;" 2. "Pulpit Pleasantry;" 3. "A Sketch of President James Madison;" 4. "The American Bible Society and its Work;" 5. "Wm. Morley Punshon;" 6. "The Confessions of Augustine;" 7. "DeLitzsch's Hebrew New Testament;" 8. "Satan in the School-house;"

9. "The Intellectual Drift of the Century;" 10. "The Doctrine of Atonement;" 11. "The Equity of Providence;" 12. "The Blue Laws of Connecticut;" 13. "Woman's Worth;" 14. "The Unknown God." Of these papers, which are all well written, we note the eighth, which is a vigorous assault on the school system of the New England States, to which the press in those States will do well to give attention; the ninth, which offers an array of facts and testimonies to prove that the intellectual drift of the century, despite the apprehensions of many minds, is not away from but toward stronger belief in Christianity; and the tenth, in which Dr. Burney contends for a theory of the atonement which is more in harmony with the so-called liberal theology than with Holy Scripture. The editor, in his own department, cuts its foundations away, and leaves it like a house swept from its base of sand by a pitiless storm.

THE *North American Review* for May discusses: 1. "The Gospel for Wealth;" 2. "Irresponsible Wealth;" 3. "Favorable Aspects of State Socialism;" 4. "The Wiman Conspiracy Unmasked;" 5. "Canada and the United States;" 6. "Napoleon's Views of Religion;" 7. "Common Sense on the Excise Question;" 8. "The Modern Extinction of Genius;" 9. "Our Business Prospects;" 10. "Lynch Law and Unrestricted Immigration;" 11. "The Politician and the Pharisee." This is an excellent number of a Review which keeps itself in strong intellectual touch with the most important questions of the hour. The first, second, sixth, and tenth of the papers merit the special attention of thinkers.

THE *Andover Review* for May has: 1. "The Life and Times of Plato;" 2. "Revelation, Inspiration, and Authority;" 3. "The Poetry of Alfred Austin;" 4. "Bazan's Russia;" 5. "Mr. Bellamy and Christianity;" 6. "The Function of Public Prayer." These papers have a claim to a literary character; but the second, though written in a philosophical vein, and containing much that is true, will be more acceptable to minds tinctured with rationalism than to scripturally orthodox thinkers. Its key-note is struck in two brief sentences, to wit: "The old conception of revelation embodied in an inspired book as complete, infallible, therefore sufficient and final, is not, then, true. . . . It is, therefore, worse than wasted energy to defend and promulgate such a conception." In harmony with this avowal is its theory that every manifestation of God in nature, in human history, and especially in great minds is as truly a divine revelation as is the content of Holy Writ!

THE *Chautauquan* for May is replete with papers characterized by literary ability and good taste. The famous Dryasdust is not among its contributors. It caters judiciously for all classes of readers who are seeking healthy food for the mind.—*The Methodist Magazine* for May has illustrated papers on "Zurich," "Napoleon at St. Helena," and "A Visit to Epworth." As usual, it is lively, varied, and instructive.—*The Missionary Review of the World* for May is alive with the thoughts of men whose

souls are yearning with desire for the speedy evangelization of the world. We have only space to note as especially expressive of their spirit Dr. Happer's "One Thousand More Missionaries for China," and Mr. Moorhead's report of the "Student Volunteers' Convention."—*The Home Maker* for April treats, with literary ability, of questions of special interest to women, such as art, home comforts, medical schools for women, women's clubs, etc. It is fairly well illustrated. Mrs. Croly (Jenny June) is its editor.—*The Catholic World* for April gives some interesting historic statements respecting "The Metric System of Measures," continues its "Life of Father Hecker," and explains the methods of the so-called "Catholic Truth Society," which is a species of papal tract society aiming to propagate Romanism by means of cheap publications. That this name of "Truth Society" is a misnomer is made evident by its purpose to teach that Catholicism is numerically the "representative" and "banner religion of the United States!" The census figures prove that this assertion is false. Yet this "Truth Society" is expected to proclaim it! Be it so. Romanism has the blasphemous lie of the pope's vicegerency for its foundation-stone! Lying is therefore its peculiar vice and pervades it throughout.—*The African Methodist Episcopal Church Review* for April is characterized by the variety, ability, and adaptedness of its seventeen interesting articles. Education, temperance, philosophy, and the development of the Negro are its leading topics.—*Christian Thought* for April contains six thoughtful papers: we name, 1. "Scientific Conception of a Spiritual World;" 2. "The Conflict of Sixteen Centuries;" 3. "The Religious Future of the Nation;" 4. "Evolution and Morality;" 6. "Christian Experience of a Child."—*Harper's New Monthly Magazine* for May is rich in the quality of its articles and in the number and beauty of its illustrations. Among its best papers we note, "The Argentine People," by Bishop Walden; "The Republic of Uruguay," by Theodore Child; and "Roman London," by Eugene Lawrence.—*The Contemporary Review* for April treats of, 1. "The Savoy Dynasty, the Pope, and the Republic;" 2. "Constance Naden;" 3. "The Influence of Democracy on Literature;" 4. "A Basis of Positive Morality;" 5. "Sofia Revisited;" 6. "The Last Days of the Earth;" 7. "Theology at King's College;" 8. "National Pensions;" 9. "Protection of Wild Birds' Eggs;" 10. "Anglo-American Copyright;" 11. "The Colonization Report;" 12. "Canada and the States."—*The Nineteenth Century* for April has fourteen papers, of which we have only space to note one, on "Science and the Future Life," which contends that the facts of science apart from revelation justify the hope, if not the belief, "that there is a life beyond the grave;" and another on "Talleyrand's Memoirs," in which Lord Acton critically summarizes this long-expected work, of which he says that "by it we are made to know the great diplomat better," and "all that Talleyrand says, and much that he conceals, brings into vivid light one of the wonders of modern politics."—*The Gospel in All Lands* for May is replete with facts fitted to stimulate missionary zeal, and to furnish materials for working into grand missionary speeches.

BOOKS: CRITIQUES AND NOTICES.

WHAT IS A BOOK?

A BOOK is a representation or embodiment of thought. If the act of writing, as Max Müller has suggested, be the act of thinking *verbally*, a book is the expression of thought in words. If it were possible to reveal mental action by any other agency than words, the result would not be a book, but another mechanical instrument. In the present condition of intellectual life the limitation of thought to words as a means of manifestation is recognized, and the book is the supreme external agent in the service of the human mind. The chief point of inquiry, therefore, relates to those books that not only are perfect in their representation of the mind's action, but also reflect the largest results of investigation, criticism, and knowledge. The following belong to the class of true books: *Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah*, by Alfred Edersheim; *Living Thoughts of John Wesley*, by James H. Potts; *The Book of Isaiah*, by G. A. Smith; *Hegel's Logic*, by W. T. Harris; and *Mechanism and Personality*, by F. A. Shoup.

RELIGION, THEOLOGY, AND BIBLICAL LITERATURE.

Judaism and Christianity. A Sketch of the Progress of Thought from Old Testament to New Testament. By CRAWFORD HOWELL FOY, Professor in Harvard University. 8vo, pp. 456. Boston: Little, Brown, & Co. Price, cloth, \$3.

The study of the development of biblical thought in all its phases—literary, ethical, and religious—from the period of Ezra to the close of the New Testament canon, including the literary activity of the Jews during the less known Maccabean period, is enchanting in itself and necessary to a proper understanding of the intimate relations between Judaism and Christianity. For a while prior to the exile Judaic culture was in collapse, and the religious life of the people lost its power and significance, and was perverted by the prevailing influence of idolatry. After the restoration, though there was no revival of the earlier instincts, and no resumption of the former glory of Israel, the Jewish ritualism was re-established and a new epoch in Hebrew history was inaugurated. Never reaching a high stage of development either in literature or religion, it finally declined, and gave way to the religion of a new Teacher for whose advent the whole system of Judaism was in some sense a preparation. With his appearance came new ideas, new religious forms, a more definite system of teaching, culminating in more complete revelations and a stronger objective frame-work of supernaturalism. Under his training the apostles developed the system as he left it, giving the world the religion known as Christianity. To trace the history of these changes, with the environing germinal influences of each period, with their results on social and religious culture, and their variations both in the degree of their expression and the depth of their impres-

sion, enters into the plan of the author of this work. He evidently comprehends the magnitude of the subject, recognizing that for its true exposition he must deal with facts, and estimate them according to their true value and right relation with one another. It appears that at times reliable data are not at hand; an hiatus in history occurs, and he is without guidance unless a buoyant imagination enables him to supply the missing factors and connect separate periods or times. This difficulty, however, meets every student, and is no more embarrassing to one than to another. The only point is the manner in which they overcome it.

In the treatment of the historic progress of biblical thought the author is openly and decidedly rationalistic, departing as far from conservative views as the most pronounced German critic of to-day has ventured to do; in fact, the book is a reflection of the extreme results of German criticism. At the same time it is acknowledged that in many respects the author is influenced in his investigations by a knowledge of laws common to all literature, and seemingly by a desire to place Christianity on a right but advanced basis. The strange thing is that the laws of literature should be perverted in the interest of rationalism, and that Christianity can only be understood in the light of its teachings. It has already been demonstrated that the laws of literature are not antagonistic to the conservative or historical theory of religion; and that Christianity more clearly reveals its content according to conservative than to rationalistic principles of investigation. The author, however, decides in favor of the rationalistic process, and the result may be anticipated.

The first sentence of the book contains an error. "The rise of Christianity out of Judaism," says the author, "is a fact which, though of enormous significance, is yet in conformity with a well-defined law of human progress." The statement is plausible, but it is not historically accurate. Christianity, though deriving some material from Judaism, had a distinct origin in Jesus Christ, who was not a development of the old religion or a connection between the old and the new. Admitting the transference of law, monotheism, and the sacrificial idea from the one to the other, the act of transference was not spontaneous or natural, did not occur before Christ's teaching, or before he himself authorized such transfer. Nor did they constitute the essentials of the new religion, for he modified all of them, and formulated concepts entirely foreign to Judaism, and upon which his religion primarily is based. Rationalism, however, insists on regarding Christianity as the development of Judaism because it can account for it in no other way.

Beginning with an error, the book can hardly fail to pursue its purpose untrammelled by its influence. The thought of the author that religion develops according to natural processes is applied with vigor to Christianity, in utter disregard of the presumption that, as a divine religion, it possibly may have been developed by other means than the common methods of religion. All are weighed in the same scales and determined by the same system of valuation. If art, politics, and science have refashioned other religions, they also must have governed, by the law of interaction, in the

expansion of the Christian religion, whereas it is generally conceded that the Christian religion has modified and controlled art, politics, and to some extent the scientific thought of the world. Without, however, discussing any further the principles of the books, we pass to its application to the literary history of some books of the Bible in proof of the author's rationalistic bias. He attributes (pp. 55, 56) legendary material to the Chronicles; designates the books of Jonah and Esther as romances; characterizes Daniel as an old legendary figure, and the chronology of the book as an irreconcilable contradiction with history (p. 64), and generalizes on others, with certain Apocryphal books, as the natural product of the national spirit. On page 133, referring the origin of the Levitical ritual to a period after the exile, it occurs to him that it might be deception to attribute it to Moses, but he says, not necessarily a *deception*! On page 130 he is positive that the New Testament writers do not claim inspiration, as if that fact proves that they were not inspired or that they intended to say they were not inspired; and on page 136 he discredits the quotations in the New Testament from the Old Testament by saying, "Words were made to mean any thing which they might suggest." In his exposition of the literary development of the books with the various questions naturally suggested the author offers nothing new, but is merely on German ground. He does not even startle us, though it is important in itself, by his "advanced" view respecting the relation of Jesus to Christianity. Jesus, according to this author, added nothing to the existing idea of immortality; did not represent himself as a sacrifice for sin (p. 419); did not regard himself as superhuman. The Church is credited with originating many of the conceptions of Christianity, Paul in particular being modestly condemned for his dogmatism and alleged fallaciousness. It is enough to say that as the Judaism of the book is not the Judaism of the Old Testament, so the Christianity of the book is not the Christianity of the New Testament, and the relation of the two systems, as depicted by the author, is entirely misunderstood and perverted.

Prophecy and History in Relation to the Messiah. The Warburton Lectures for 1880-1884, with two Appendices on the Arrangement, Analysis, and Recent Criticism of the Pentateuch. By ALFRED EDERSHEIM, M.A. OXON., D.D., Ph.D., Author of *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*. Author's Edition. 12mo, pp. 391. New York: Anson D. F. Randolph & Co. Price, cloth, \$1 75.

Conservative criticism respecting the Old Testament, especially the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuchal legislation and the predictive significance of prophecy in its relation to Jesus Christ, may claim a masterly vindication in the scholarly treatise of Dr. Edersheim. Without prejudice and with rare qualification for the investigation of the mooted questions in biblical literature, he has probed the elementary objections to the historical views of the Church only to find them untenable, irrational, and entirely inconclusive in their methods and results. Patiently and thoroughly he analyzes the Wellhausen theory, rejecting its essential peculiarities, and with it all other theories that predicate an exilic or post-exilic origin of the Pentateuchal literature. While not severe in statement he so

completely disposes of the rationalistic hypothesis as to render unnecessary any extra argument in defense of Christian faith in the Old Testament. His main purpose, however, is to affirm the distinctive value of those prophecies that, according to common interpretation, had their fulfillment in the personal Messiah. Christian believers will agree with him that "to say that Jesus is the Christ means that he is the Messiah promised and predicted in the Old Testament." To hold any other view is not only to subvert faith in the Messiah, but to weaken faith in the authority of the Old Testament. With this basal conviction, both as a guidance and a restraint, the author proceeds to unfold the subject, first in its general aspects and then in its particular application to Jesus as the Messiah. He clears the path of stumbling-blocks by showing that the Messianic hope could not have originated in the time of Jesus nor in the period succeeding the exile, but that it was a primary element of the old religion from its beginning. From this starting-point he traces its development in the kingdom of God under the direction of priests, kings, and prophets, and in the various embodiments of the national literature of the Hebrews, appearing as a dominant idea in their history, a sublime conception in their poetry, and a vital element in their prophecy. Nor is he restricted to the Old Testament in the exhibition of the Messianic idea, for he finds the New Testament authoritative and conclusive on that subject in the claims of Jesus Christ himself and the teachings of the apostles. The practices and teachings of the primitive Church also contribute confirmatory evidence of the prevailing opinion touching the Messiahship of Christ, and that in him the prophecies of the Old Testament find their chief fulfillment. We indicate, too briefly, the character of this able work, but we trust it will lead our readers to purchase it, and to peruse it with entire confidence in its trustworthiness and value.

The Book of Isaiah. By the Rev. GEORGE ADAM SMITH, M.A., Minister of Queen's Cross Church, Aberdeen. In two volumes. Vol. II. *Isaiah xl-lxvi. With a Sketch of the History of Israel from Isaiah to the Exile.* 8vo, pp. 474. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price, cloth, \$1 50.

Of unusual interest, because of its scholarly dealing with the critical problem of the authorship of the second part of Isaiah, is this second volume on the Book of Isaiah. The author firmly maintains the unknown authorship of the second part, satisfying himself both by refuting the common arguments in favor of the Isaian unity and composition of the entire book and by advancing arguments in favor of another author of the second part, that the book must be accepted as the product of two periods, two conditions, and at least two writers. To those who have already accepted the results of historical criticism his statement will seem more like a recapitulation of these views than an original defense of his position; while to those who are still under the influence of old conservative instincts the argument will seem inconclusive, and to rest more upon a prepossession than the discovery of dividing lines between the two portions of the prophetic book. He makes it clear, however, that there are literary difficul-

ties in the orthodox view which orthodoxists will be compelled to remove; and that, on the other hand, it is clear that the "advanced" view abounds with difficulties equally unyielding and destructive. What then? Until the extreme critics remove their own difficulties and extinguish the long-established argument of the orthodoxist the latter may claim to have the field. It is the "advanced" theory that needs both to explain and defend itself; such a task rests not upon the conservative scholars. When the author insists that the word "righteousness" has one meaning in the first part and an entirely different, if not reverse, meaning in the second part, he violates etymology, historical theology, and scriptural exegesis; but one may readily see that this philological achievement is necessary to the support of his theory. So in respect to nearly every argument he employs, the suspicion is raised against its genuineness or relevancy by its violation of some canon of interpretation, or its strange use, if not misuse, of historical phenomena. Recognizing his method as objectionable, he nevertheless makes a case and is entitled to consideration. As his book is based upon his critical conception of the authorship of Isaiah it is needless to refer to its contents, methods, or results, the interpretation of the whole being such as to sustain the preliminary theory. Even in this respect it gives evidence of calm study, of a desire to penetrate the hidden meaning of the writer, and of a purpose to exalt the prophetic word. The work is one of the best in the series known as the *Expositor's Bible*.

Reason and Authority in Religion. By J. MACBRIDE STERRETT, D.D., Professor of Ethics and Apologetics in Seabury Divinity School. 12mo, pp. 184. New York: Thomas Whittaker. Price, cloth, \$1.

The reader will be impressed with the scholarship, devoutness, and evident strength of the critical faculty of the writer of this book. Though he may not accept all its conclusions, he will be stimulated in research along biblical lines by the force of the author's statements and the apparently rational discriminations that are drawn and unfolded. In this day of concrete inquiry it is not surprising that not a few of the old beliefs should disappear, nor that religion itself should be asked to restate its authority. To this purpose on the part of Christian writers there can be no objection, nor even to the process of investigation and the critical tests of truth that many of them apply. It is refreshing to be told (p. 23) that "till recently the burden of Apologetics has been the maintenance of Orthodoxy, which has largely meant Calvinism founded upon an unhistorical interpretation of an infallible Bible. Such Apologetics have had their day. They have almost destroyed both Orthodoxy and the Bible." Methodists have always contended that Calvinism and Orthodoxy are not synonymous, and can rejoice that their position is now affirmed by others; and if the chief work of the critics shall be to destroy the old Calvinistic forms of belief the world will join the Methodists in their hallelujah. The author rightly aims to seek the *urgrund*, or single ground of authority in religion, setting aside the usual pleas of an infallible Church, an infallible Bible, and an infallible reason, and finally traces it to a personal First Principle,

a God. In rejecting an infallible Church he strikes at Roman Catholicism; in rejecting an infallible Bible he thinks he is striking at Protestantism; and in rejecting an infallible reason he seems to strike at rationalism. From the form of his statements it appears that he has magnified his problem, for it is not exactly correct to say that Protestantism is wholly based on the idea of an infallible Bible, though it has generally maintained that doctrine. In this respect the author writes under the spell of modern criticism, stating (p. 88) that the Bible "is not errorless, or infallible, or of equal value throughout." And further (p. 88), "The Christian consciousness, rather than individuals, is the best interpreter of it." This sentence puzzles us, for (pp. 25, 26) he contends for the right of private judgment, but here exalts the Christian consciousness as superior to individual judgment; and elsewhere he denies the right of the Church to interpret the Bible for the people, while here he concedes that "the Christian consciousness," which is the collective judgment of the Church, is the best interpreter. We mention these contradictions, not to detract from the value of the book, but to show that the author is confused, or, rather, unsettled in his own mind, touching these questions. His discussion of the psychological forms of religion is in harmony with his main position, that ultimate authority in religion is traceable to a higher source than man, and that the Anglo-Saxon and Teutonic elements in it carry us nearer to the ideal authority than the Roman conception. His critical study of Martineau's *Seat of Authority in Religion* and of *Lux Mundi* is valuable, though not specially new. The book is the product of the times and of the critical spirit of the times, and is therefore to be read in connection with critical work.

Living Thoughts of John Wesley. A Comprehensive Selection of the Living Thoughts of the Founder of Methodism as contained in his Miscellaneous Works. By JAMES H. PORRS. 8vo, pp. 562. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. Price, cloth, \$2.

The literature of John Wesley is of a peculiar type and covers a wide range of subjects. Unlike that of the theologian, it is theological; and, differing from writers in general, he is historical, polemical, poetical, philosophical, epistolary, dogmatic, and in every sense a cosmopolitan or universal writer. In his Miscellaneous Works the intellectual and religious life of the man appears in every possible form: he is grave and gay; he is didactic and paternal; he is doctrinal and practical; he is philosophic and poetic. In his uniqueness he stands alone, and yet seems in some respects as other men. In his thinking he is apart from his age, but understands its instincts and undertakes to recall it to sensibility. In his writing he exhibits a style different from that of his contemporaries, but is amply English in phraseology and sentiment. He wrote for his times, and also for all times; hence the life-force of his Works. He wrote in particular for the people called "Methodists;" hence with his breadth of view and cosmopolitan spirit his writings have a local coloring and a denominational application which must be understood in order that he may be fairly interpreted. Our people have been more or less familiar

with his published sermons, as they have been urged upon their attention as the best expression of his theological teaching, and as constituting the doctrinal basis of Methodism. Of the volumes containing his sermons, as well as his letters to various persons, dissertations on new subjects, appeals to Christians, defenses of doctrinal points, definitions, explanations of ambiguous teachings, and a variety of papers on all subjects within his scope as a teacher and preacher, the public has not known enough; nor has any successful attempt to reveal the hidden treasures of those volumes been made until Dr. Potts conceived the project and executed it in the volume now before us.

Of this compilation it is not enough to say that it embodies the rarest gems of Wesleyan literature. Omitting extracts from the Sermons, Dr. Potts undertook to sift the five volumes of Miscellaneous Works with the view of collecting and publishing those portions which possess a permanent interest, and which contain the life-thoughts, the working ideas, of Mr. Wesley. To do this thoroughly required more than an average literary taste, more than an ordinary skill in arrangement, and more than a common understanding of Methodism. To prune Mr. Wesley; to decide between the local and the universal; to select the logical from the rhetorical; to separate between the transient and permanent; to distinguish the polemical from the practical, the theological from the sentimental, the didactic from the emotional, and the religious from the philosophical—this was in part the task of the compiler. Without special qualifications he had not succeeded; without the Methodist spirit he had failed; without years of application he had given us a medley instead of a well-arranged consecutive series of papers that reflect the great resources of Mr. Wesley in the various emergencies of his long and laborious life. We therefore congratulate the Church on the success of the author in the performance of a task as delicate as it was difficult, and as completely executed as readers can well desire.

Henceforth we shall expect a wider familiarity with Mr. Wesley's opinions and teachings. The volume should go into general circulation, be read in the Christian family, and interest multitudes in the life of a man who, great in his times, grows in influence by virtue of his Works with the flight of years.

Fire from Strange Altars. By Rev. J. N. FRADENBURGH, Ph.D., D.D., Author of *Witnesses from the Dust*, etc. 12mo, pp. 324. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Price, cloth, 90 cents.

As a witness for Christianity archæology speaks in no uncertain voice. Whoever would scrutinize all the data in confirmation of the Scriptures can least afford to omit from his circle of proof this order of testimony; and whoever in breadth of spirit opens his soul to the powerful influences of evidence extraneous to the word will find his faith powerfully quickened by the verdict of antiquity on the truthfulness of God's Book. Dr. Fradenburgh's work is an emphasis of the value of archæology as a witness to the truth. It might not transcend the bounds of good judg-

ment to venture a belief in the divine direction of the archæological discoveries that he so faithfully describes, since the world seems alert for some new proof of Christian supernaturalism. The wealth of disclosures which archæology is to make in the future is also intimated in this volume of Dr. Fradenburgh. The innermost citadels of unbelief shall yield before other proofs which will spring like a besieging army from the dust. Such confirmations of the Bible as are found in the religions of Babylon, Phenicia, and Egypt does Dr. Fradenburgh collate in his present work. In the belief that many of the forms of the Israelitish worship were borrowed from heathen faiths, and that it is to this extent a growth, he opens these "three goodly volumes" for comparison with the Old Testament records and for their verification. This central proposition, that the roots of Christianity may be found imbedded in other soils, we may guardedly accept. To establish such a claim Dr. Fradenburgh has proceeded with that employment of resources, that accuracy of treatment, and that Oriental vigor of description which has marked his previous volumes, and for which we have no words but those of approval.

PHILOSOPHY, LANGUAGE, AND GENERAL SCIENCE.

Hegel's Logic. A Book on the Genesis of the Categories of the Mind. A Critical Exposition. By WILLIAM T. HARRIS, LL.D., U. S. Commissioner of Education. 16mo, pp. 436. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. Price, cloth, \$1 50.

The revival of interest in Hegel, especially in Germany, promises, perhaps, no revolution in current philosophy, but it may inaugurate a definite tendency to modes of thought, forms of expression, and certainty in the presentation of results. For many years Kant has dominated the philosophical thought of the world; but under his influence it unconsciously veered toward the most absolute agnosticism if not incipient atheism. Hegel was a different thinker, and conducted thought to an absolute idealism which virtually overthrew itself. However, soberly reviewing Hegel, philosophy has discovered virtue, if not safety, in his basal teachings, especially in his principles of logic and the laws of mind. It is to bring these into prominence and re-affirm the validity of the Hegelian system that Dr. Harris publishes this volume. The reader will at once be impressed with the largeness of the subject and the critical method of the author in its discussion. Eager to exhibit the salient features of the Hegelian system, and to defend it from narrow interpretations, he is by no means an indiscriminate admirer of its various ideas; on the contrary, he indulges in criticism, revealing its weakness, especially in its theological bearings, and shows the necessity of careful revision of its logical categories before they can be accepted. Chief among the excellencies of the work is the author's showing that Hegel was the first to unite Greek ontological results with German psychological results—a point usually overlooked, but necessary to an understanding of the history of philosophy, and equally necessary to final results in inquiry. For Grecian philosophy was defective by limitation to one problem, which, however great, did not

include every thing; and German philosophy, however accurate, is inadequate to the apprehension of universal truth. Even the ancient and modern systems, united as in Hegel, fail in reaching an ultimate reality, requiring for this purpose the added truths of Christianity. Nevertheless, in Hegel there was progress beyond Greek thought, but Germany for a time repudiated him, and has accomplished nothing since his day except in psychology. Hegel is of service again because of his fundamental ideas of mind and its power of self-action; hence, he is restudied; hence this book. The author omits nothing essential to an understanding of the logic of the German thinker: he considers the relation of philosophy to science, law, and religion; emphasizes being, essence, and idea as the three categories of his logic; and discusses his doctrine of the absolute as the initial point of his system, indulging in strictures upon it as well as upon his method of investigation. So fully has the author elaborated the subject, so complete is his analysis of the principles it involves, and so compactly written is his book, being attractive in style and finish, that next to Hegel's works themselves we commend this volume as the most desirable in the market.

Mechanism and Personality. An Outline of Philosophy in the Light of the Latest Scientific Research. By FRANCIS A. SHOUR, D.D., Professor of Analytical Physics, University of the South. 12mo, pp. 343. Boston: Ginn & Co. Cloth, \$1 30.

We have in this book rather the statement than the settlement of the problem of mind and matter, the author attempting the former rather than the latter. We must not be understood, however, as depreciating the value of the results given, for the whole field has been quite generally surveyed, and the conclusions both of philosophy and science have been intimated. It is true that science has not fully elaborated a satisfactory theory of the mechanical universe, or of the more limited interacting forces of the cosmos, nor has philosophy sufficiently grasped the great problem of psychology—the entity called mind. So that while the advance in both departments has been rapid, particularly in science, the questions of mechanism and personality still require solution. The author makes this evident, but is not embarrassed by the limitations of his subject in its prosecution or in the investigation of the relations of mind and matter. Whatever the materialist may conclude, the author recognizes a chasm between pure physiology and consciousness, which is the basis of his tracings and investigations. He is led to study the human structure both as matter and an organic mechanism, but personality, both in its psychical aspect and its many differentiations, with its various relations to the external world, receives dignified and philosophic attention. It is in the development of personality as an independent factor, with its unity of nature, its variety of self-acting forces, its will-power, and the sovereignty of the conscience in ethical activities that the author passes from an ordinary to a strong and decisive thinker. Even here, however, he is under the influence of Lotze, as in the treatment of the scientific relations of his subject he is under the influence of Darwin, Spencer, and Tyndall. When asked why

Lotze's philosophy was receding from view a German scholar replied, "Lotze ought to have lived to take care of it." Notwithstanding its imperfections and want of system, Lotze's work was incisive, and in some respects almost as original as a revelation. Nevertheless, since his death it has declined in influence. Its resuscitation in other systems or by other teachers is a proof of its vitality and its primitive worth. Professor Shoup has adopted some of Lotze's germinal thoughts, and incorporated them in the work before us. Without this feature the work would be useful; with it, it is a safe guide in metaphysics. As a whole the work is an original combination of original material on subjects the most intricate, the most vital, the most profound; and while brief enough in its treatment it is also comprehensive enough to satisfy the student and instruct the scholar.

Principles of Social Economics Inductively Considered and Practically Applied. With Criticisms on Current Theories. By GEORGE GUNTON, Author of *Wealth and Progress*. 8vo, pp. 451. New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons. Price, cloth, \$1 75.

We must pronounce this work a valuable contribution to the industrial questions in which at this time the nations are interested. In his study of the subject the author shows a competent familiarity with the history of the laboring classes back to the days of feudalism, and an anxiety for the application of the best economic principles and the broadest statesmanship to the determination of the social conditions of life. Many of his readers will dissent from the basal principles of the book, while they will admit the need of social reformation and the failure of old-time remedies for the industrial woes of the world. In the evolution of things it has happened that labor is now largely performed by the use or aid of machinery, and the adjustment of wages according to the change is a necessity. By virtue of progress in the forms of labor wealth has gained an immense advantage, but it does not follow that the laborer has lost any thing. We are sure he too has gained in wages, in opportunities of self-culture, and in the conditions of success. To base a reconstruction of society either upon the rights of the capitalist or upon the rights of the laborer would be wrong, because in either case the other party would be ignored; and yet the author proposes "the laborer as the initial point of observation." It occurs to us that society as a whole, and not the individual, should be the "initial point," and the constantly recurring point in legislation and in methods of industry. Adam Smith's theories are not adapted to the conditions of to-day, nor are the advanced theories of socialistic reformers. The laborer is not the only human being in a nation, and he has no more rights than any other human being. In this exaltation of the laborer to the "initial point" of reconstruction lies the error of this book. It does not surprise us, therefore, that certain well-established politico-economical principles, such as the law of demand and supply, are overthrown and new laws substituted, all in the interest of a class rather than of society as a whole. The author expounds the principles of social progress, of economic production and economic distribution, and of practical statesmanship, in an orderly way, revealing the

infirmities of industrial life, but ever keeping in mind that reconstruction must harmonize with the new conditions, and the interest of the industrial world. The book is written in a pleasant style, and though partisan in spirit contains much that ought to be considered in the investigation of the great problem it discusses.

HISTORY, BIOGRAPHY, AND TOPOGRAPHY.

The Journal of Sir Walter Scott. From the Original Manuscript at Abbotsford. Popular Edition. 8vo, pp. 621. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$1 50.

The private Journal of Sir Walter Scott extends from 1825 to 1832. It relates almost to every thing in his personal history during that period, and to other matters not personal, such as the action of European governments, the drift of public sentiment on local and national questions, the attitude and characteristics of public men, and the condition of the world at large. Dwelling on the minutiae of ordinary life, such as lodgings, meals, horses, drives, cabmen, the weather, roads, etc., he often rises to statesmanship in his opinions of current affairs, and beguiles the reader with a variety of facts and impressions that are as valuable as they are rare. He opens his inner life to public inspection in the details of his literary habits and in his relation to friends and others. He reveals his idiosyncrasies, his prejudices, his tastes and infirmities, his ethical principles and religious convictions. The Journal is autobiography condensed, furnishing the material for a more elaborate history of his life. Written as such journals usually are, containing the private judgment of its author of other men, its publication was wisely delayed until the present time. Sir Walter Scott may have been mistaken as to the merits of men with whom he differed, but he expressed himself fully in his Journal, and the world may now know his secret thoughts. As a journal, in respect to its method, contents, and purpose, it is a model. It is never written carelessly, but in an easy, graceful style; compact on some subjects, diffusive on others; narrating little incidents as if they were important, and embellishing an account of great events with elegance and a sense of their relation to permanent conditions. It will afford profitable reading to those who are interested in the life of the great novelist, who, as in his published works, exhibits in his Journal the same literary traits and the same heroic persistence in the performance of literary duties.

A Short History of Anglo-Saxon Freedom. The Polity of the English-speaking Race Outlined in its Inception, Development, Diffusion, and Present Condition. By JAMES K. HOSMER, Professor in Washington University. 12mo, pp. 420. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. Price, cloth, \$2.

The rise of the Anglo-Saxons, with the development of their tendencies to constitutional government as represented in the English people, with their parliamentary institutions, and in the United States, with their organic nationalism and the individual freedom of citizenship, is vividly and vigorously traced in the pages of this book. Necessarily recapitu-

lating familiar history, both in social and national aspects, the author has so far departed in the combination of his materials from other writers as substantially to offer a new book to American readers. He legitimately commences with the primitive Saxons on the Elbe, but soon introduces the reader to the conquest of Great Britain, rapidly passing in the subsequent development of its civil institutions from epoch to epoch until he is face to face with the consummation of the Anglo-Saxon spirit and purpose in the American government and its people. The English phase of parliamentary government is attractively represented; but the author is incited to a more enthusiastic appreciation of the American constitution and the probabilities of the American people in their new conditions and with their rare opportunities. If at any point he is open to the charge of optimism it is in the consideration of the future of America, together with the high hopes he expresses for the dominance of the Anglo-Saxon brotherhood in the world. He is not unmindful of defects, both in English methods of civil life and in the growing energies of the American people; but he foresees a triumph for the Anglo-Saxon spirit that his readers will estimate as altogether probable, if not certain. The book stimulates patriotism and a broad love for the English-speaking race.

Our Italy. By CHARLES DUDLEY WARNER, Author of *Their Pilgrimage*, *Studies in the South and West*, etc. 8vo, pp. 226. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, fancy cloth, \$2 50.

In this charming volume, with its suggestive title, is contained an unusual account of the features and possibilities of Southern California. The existence of such a garden-spot of beauty and fertility seems an equitable offset to the severe climatic regions of the United States along the Atlantic sea-board or the relatively barren portions of some sections of the South. In such an equipoise is traceable the hand of a wise Providence, and inheres the possibility of the largest national growth. As one who is thoroughly informed upon the subject in hand, Mr. Warner describes the topography, healthfulness, scenery, and fertility of Southern California. Persons contemplating a removal to this region will find in his book much practical information on questions relating to the establishment of a home and the earning of a livelihood. The most prosaic matters of inquiry receive from him a sufficient and sometimes elaborate notice; so that the volume must prove a useful and complete source of instruction on every-day affairs to the California emigrant. But Mr. Warner has contributed far more than a guide-book of a better order to the literature of the year. He is, besides, highly artistic in his sketches of California beauty. The reader finds himself quickly and thoroughly *en rapport* with the author in his descriptions. The soft scenery of San Bernardino, the mid-winter roses of Pasadena, the entrancing coast of Monterey, and the balmy air of Los Angeles all take on the phase of reality, and one finds himself, under Mr. Warner's enchantment, a participator in all. Fineness of illustrations and finish of typography lend additional charm to the subject-matter. The book is superlative in its department.

Lord Clive. By Colonel Sir CHARLES WILSON. 16mo, pp. 221. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. Price, cloth, 60 cents.

Warren Hastings. By Sir ALFRED LYALL, K.C.B. 12mo, pp. 225. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. Price, cloth, 60 cents.

Havelock. By ARCHIBALD FORBES. 12mo, pp. 223. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. Price, cloth, 60 cents.

Three of England's greatest representatives in India are enumerated above. The story of English rule in that equatorial land, with its alternating fortunes, its sometimes minuteness of detail, its romances, and its growth to pre-eminence, is essentially the story of the civil and military leaders who shaped its fortunes. To read their lives critically is therefore to read the history of the movements which have added new luster to the English name and given her a prestige among the southern nations. Clive was a man for the emergency. His presence in India at the age of eighteen was in the spirit of adventure. The spectacle of military impotency and disasters stirred his martial spirit into life, and evoked those exceptional qualities which gave him leadership. Undaunted courage, sometimes akin to rashness, promptness of execution, caution in emergencies beyond his years, and a genius for wresting victory from defeat, marked his career, and insured his rise from obscurity to the governorship of Bengal and the peerage. We cannot admire his imperiousness, his susceptibility to flattery, or the method of his enrichment, which is the one great stain upon his record. As a public officer, however, he was no ordinary character. His military successes, justifying the statement that he was "born with an undoubted genius for war," his successful foreign policy, and the quality of his statesmanship at home, were all influential toward English success. With an able hand has Sir Charles Wilson drawn the picture of this versatile leader.

Warren Hastings was an equal master of the great problems of English administration in India. A few years the junior of Lord Clive, it is interesting to notice that he served under Clive in a subordinate capacity, and it would be an instructive pursuit, did it fall within the province of this review, to trace the influence of Clive upon one equally endowed with wide qualities who was shortly to follow in his steps as governor of Bengal. The remarkable trial of Warren Hastings, covering the period of seven years, and costing the accused some £1,000,000, is denominated by the present author "the most remarkable and perhaps the most generally interesting incident in the life of Hastings." In such an estimate Sir Alfred Lyall re-opens the famous chapter and summons the reader in judgment to the tribunal. If Hastings was arraigned like Clive, like him also he was acquitted and afterward enjoyed the fruits of his Indian sacrifices in the esteem of his countrymen. The many qualities and the valuable services of Hastings receive their equitable treatment in the present number of this series.

Unlike Clive and Hastings, Havelock was distinctively a soldier. His work in India succeeded that of Hastings by more than half a century. He was an instance of one who came late to fame, having been twenty-three years in the service and forty-three years of age before he had

attained the rank of captain. His participation in the invasion of Afghanistan, in the Gwalior campaign, and more particularly in the stirring scenes of the Sepoy rebellion, make up this martial story. The roll of drums and the noise of battle fill the volume. But, however important his campaigns and far-reaching his victories, the reader is more attracted by the symmetrical character of this English soldier. No less than his bravery and his victories in battle do these excellencies of life contribute to his lasting renown. To industry, resoluteness of purpose, and high principle as a natural endowment, were added those virtues which ensue from the Christian profession. Few modern soldiers better illustrated the principles of the Gospel in practical life. This sketch of Havelock, with the associate stories of Clive and Hastings, must be regarded as among the most instructive of the series on English "Men of Action."

Port Tarascon. The Last Adventures of the Illustrious Tartarin. By ALPHONSE DAUDET. Translated by HENRY JAMES. Illustrated by Rossi, Myrbach, Montégut, Bieler, and Montevard. 8vo, pp. 359. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$2 50.

This is the third volume from Daudet on the adventures of a constructed hero, a bachelor, of small physical proportions, but born with a genius for illustrating the comic, the pathetic, and the philanthropic aspects of human nature. In his roivings and various experiences he is the author and victim of many catastrophes, growing out of the wide and varying possibilities of his nature, but never really imagining himself culpable or responsible. He is innocent, and yet makes mistakes; veracious, and yet tells lies; modest, and yet is boastful; sympathetic, but harmonizes with nothing. To understand fully the career of this singular individual one should read the preceding volumes, in which one finds on exhibition his peculiar traits, such as his passion for pursuing imaginary beasts, his use of poisoned arrows, lion-skins, and the generally grotesque achievements that happened either at his instance or in his presence. The style of the author happily adds to the brilliancy of the scenes described, and excites the admiration of the reader quite as much as the irreverent audacity and the shabby and untrained idiosyncrasies of the Tartarin himself. Daudet has earned literary distinction by this satire on human nature; he has shown its capacity for folly, its love of amusement, and the fitness of the spirit of mischief-making in a prosy world like ours.

Freedom Triumphant. The Fourth Period of the War of the Rebellion, from September, 1864, to its Close. By CHARLES CARLETON COFFIN, Author of *Marching to Victory, Redeeming the Republic*, etc. 8vo, pp. 506. Illustrated. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, cloth, \$3.

The range of this volume—the fourth in the author's series of the War of the Rebellion—is very attractive, covering the period from the military movements under Sheridan in the Shenandoah in September, 1864, to the assassination of Abraham Lincoln and the final collapse of the South in its struggle to found a government on human slavery. In many respects this is the most interesting portion of the great history of the strife between

the North and the South, for it is a period of daylight, of hope, of nerve-force, of victory, and of consummation. In the preceding volumes we read of preparations for conflict, disquietude, and anxiety, coupled with the national purpose to go forward; also of battles and of defeats alleviated by successive developments of national strength. In this volume the nation marches with a steadier tread, and finally we hear the bugle-note of peace. It may also be added that the author, keen in his scent for details, and describing scenes with a calm and sometimes pathetic spirit, and keeping the mind of his reader upon the conflict itself in all its horrors, seems in the closing volume to write with an increased brilliancy, if not buoyancy, being affected, no doubt, by the pleasurable thought that the end of the war was in sight and his task was nearly completed. However, the closing months of the struggle were marked by severities which were not eclipsed by any thing in the previous years, as it was during this period that the Confederates invaded Tennessee, and wherever they had an army made a final and desperate stand for their "cause." At length the decisive hour came for surrender, and the hero of Appomattox accepted the army of Lee in token of the death of the so-called Confederacy. Mr. Coffin has written without prejudice, and furnished a reliable history of the great conflict. The South will interpret themselves, their motives and movements, and the results of their political fatuity somewhat differently; but they must accord to the author of these volumes both sincerity and integrity in their preparation, and dispute, if at all, the accuracy of their contents by documents as authoritative as those upon which he relied. We submit that the record of "Freedom Triumphant" over slavery, ignorance, and devotion to unpatriotic ends, as here written, will pass unchallenged by the future historian.

MISCELLANEOUS.

Sketches of Jewish Life in the First Century. Nicodemus; or, Scenes in the Days of Our Lord. Gamaliel; or, Scenes in the Times of Saint Paul. By JAMES STRONG, S.T.D., LL.D., Professor of Exegetical Theology in Drew Theological Seminary. 12mo, pp. 141. New York: Hunt & Eaton. Cincinnati: Cranston & Stowe. Price, cloth, 60 cents.

In moments of leisure Dr. Strong found time to produce the two monographs of this small volume. When the New Testament failed to give all the facts he supplied the omissions by a well-regulated Christian imagination which allowed no sensationalism on the one hand or venturesome speculation on the other. In "Nicodemus" he reproduces early Christianity, or the origin, progress, and difficulties of the Christian Church. In "Gamaliel" he depicts the career and influence of Paul, disengaging him from the mystery of antiquity. The style is that of a fiction-writer; the basis of the book is New Testament history, but some of the material is suggested by the Talmud and ancient Jewish annals; the effect on the reader is wholesome, instructive, and elevating.

The Sermon Bible. St. Matthew xxii to St. Mark xvi. 8vo, pp. 389. New York: A. C. Armstrong & Son. Price, half buckram cloth, \$1 50.

Like its companions in the series, this volume is a mosaic. Extracts from the discourses of many prominent divines make up its pages. Concerning the quality of these excerpts no dispute will be made. The endowments, the success, and the well-earned renown of the English and American sermonizers who are cited in fragmentary extracts, establish the value of the book as a volume of quotations. Whether the frequent employment of such an order of semi-commentaries makes for the intellectual vigor of the user, for accurate exegesis, or for the highest benefits to the auditor, is nevertheless a matter of serious question on which we have already spoken.

Cremation a Rational Method of Disposing of the Dead. By HOWARD HENDERSON, D.D., Pastor of Trinity Methodist Episcopal Church, Cincinnati, Ohio. Cincinnati: Geo. P. Houston. Price, paper, postpaid, 15 cents.

This is a pamphlet of 46 pages, being the amplification of a paper read before the Methodist Preachers' Meeting of Cincinnati, Ohio, and of an address delivered at the laying of the corner-stone of the Mount Olivet Crematory, New York. It discusses the subject as a sanitary, economic, and sentimental question, gives the method employed in incineration, and essays to answer the objections urged against cremation. The treatment is Christian and conservative, and an effort to rescue an important subject from the exclusive hands of theosophists and other rationalists, and as such will be kindly received by those who do not indorse the views of the author. It is a clear and concise statement of the affirmative side of the question.

Oberammergau. 1890. By WILLIAM ALLEN BUTLER. 8vo, pp. 46. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, \$2.

The scenes of the Passion Play at Oberammergau, with little local coloring, are reproduced, not in historical form, but in the highest style of poetic literature. The gospel event, with its external and internal features, is so vividly portrayed as to impress its reality upon every reader. The poet has excelled in his dramatic conception; the publishers surpass themselves in the mechanical finish of the book.

New York and Its Environs. By GUSTAV KOBBE, Author of *Jersey Coast and Pines*, etc. With Maps and Illustrations. 16mo, pp. 282. New York: Harper & Brothers. Price, \$1.

The necessity that compels the use of guide-books in unfamiliar cities and lands also demands the best directories of this nature that may be furnished. Measured by its convenient size, and its attractive maps, illustrations, and print, a desirable hand-book has been compiled by Mr. Kobbé. It would seem, however, that less attention has been paid in its preparation to religious statistics than to more secular matters of information. We thus notice the omission of many or all of the denominational headquarters or sales-rooms of the city, and in the instance of the Methodist Episcopal Church, at least, a peculiar classification of its "best-known" churches in the city. Yet these omissions presumably do not invalidate

the general excellence of the hand-book as a directory to the points of interest in the great metropolis.

The Master of the Magicians. By ELIZABETH STUART PHELPS and HERBERT D. WARD. 16mo, pp. 324. Price, cloth, \$1 25.

Come Forth! By ELIZABETH STUART PHELPS and HERBERT D. WARD. 16mo, pp. 318. Price, cloth, \$1 25.

As fanciful rather than exact portrayals of the times of Daniel and of Lazarus the above collaborations by Elizabeth Stuart Phelps and Herbert D. Ward are in places defective, in places excellent. Houghton, Mifflin, and Company, of New York, are the publishers.

A Little Loyal Red-Coat. A Story of Child-Life in New York a Hundred Years Ago. By RUTH OGDEN, Author of *His Little Royal Highness*. Second edition, with over Sixty Original Illustrations, by H. A. OGDEN. Small quarto, pp. 217. Price, cloth, \$2.

Bessie Bradford's Prize. The Third of a Series of Sequels to "The Bessie Books." By JOANNA H. MATHEWS, Author of *Maggie Bradford's Schoolmates*, etc. Illustrated by W. ST. JOHN HARPER. 12mo, pp. 266. Price, cloth, \$1 25.

The first of these books, from the press of the Frederick A. Stokes Company, New York, is a Revolutionary narrative of instructive quality. The second is a story for youth, inculcating important moral teachings.

An Elementary Latin Dictionary. By CHARLTON T. LEWIS, Ph.D., Author of *A Latin Dictionary for Schools*, etc. Small quarto, pp. 952. Price, cloth, \$2.

The Captain of the Janizaries. A Story of the Times of Scanderbeg and the Fall of Constantinople. By JAMES M. LUDLOW, D.D., Litt D. 12mo, pp. 404. Price, cloth, \$1 50.

The Aztec Treasure-House. A Romance of Contemporaneous Antiquity. Illustrated. By THOMAS A. JANVIER. 12mo, pp. 446. Price, cloth, \$1 50.

The House by the Medlar-Tree. By GIOVANNI VERGA. The Translation by MARY A. CRAIG. An Introduction by W. D. HOWELLS. 16mo, pp. 300. Price, cloth, \$1.

Ten Tales by Francois Coppée. Translated by WALTER LEARNED, with Fifty Pen-and-Ink Drawings by ALBERT E. STERNEN, and an Introduction by BRANDER MATTHEWS. 16mo, pp. 219. Price, cloth, \$1 25.

Seven Dreamers. By ANNIE TRUMBULL SLOSSON. 12mo, pp. 281. Price, cloth, \$1 25.

Stand Fast, Craig-Royston! By WILLIAM BLACK, Author of *Prince Fortunatus*, etc. 12mo, pp. 429.

In their different departments of linguistic study, history, and romance, the above volumes merit favorable notice. Their attractiveness of page and binding add to their value. Harper and Brothers, New York, are the publishers.

A Son of Issachar. A Romance of the Days of the Messiah. By ELBRIDGE S. BROOKS. 12mo, pp. 293. Price, cloth, \$1 25.

A Young Macedonian in the Army of Alexander the Great. With Sixteen Illustrations by Rev. ALFRED J. CHURCH, M.A., Lately Professor of Latin in University College, London. 12mo, pp. 325. Price, cloth, \$1 25.

The historic basis of the foregoing volumes contributes to their worth as romances. They are published by G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York.

